

# MID-AMERICA

*An Historical Review*

VOLUME 41, NUMBER 2

APRIL 1959

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

# MID-AMERICA

*An Historical Review*

APRIL 1959

VOLUME 41

NUMBER 2

---

## CONTENTS

WILLIAM HICKLING PRESCOTT:

AUTHORS' AGENT . . . . . *C. Harvey Gardiner* 67

THEODORE ROOSEVELT AND

EGYPTIAN NATIONALISM . . . . . *David H. Burton* 88

THE MIDWESTERN IMMIGRANT AND

POLITICS: A CASE STUDY . . . . . *D. Jerome Tweton* 104

THE WANING PRESTIGE OF LEWIS CASS . . . *Walter W. Stevens* 114

BOOK REVIEWS . . . . . 120

NOTES AND COMMENTS . . . . . 124

---

MANAGING EDITOR

JEROME V. JACOBSEN, *Chicago*

EDITORIAL STAFF

WILLIAM STETSON MERRILL

J. MANUEL ESPINOSA

W. EUGENE SHIELS

RAPHAEL HAMILTON

PAUL KINIERY

PAUL S. LIETZ

---

Published quarterly by Loyola University (The Institute of Jesuit History) at 50 cents a copy. Annual subscription, \$2.00; in foreign countries, \$2.50.

Entered as second class matter, August 7, 1929, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry as second class matter at the post office at Effingham, Illinois. Printed in the United States.

---

Subscription and change of address notices and all communications should be addressed to the Managing Editor at the publication and editorial offices at Loyola University, 6525 Sheridan Road, Chicago 26, Illinois.

---

# MID-AMERICA

*An Historical Review*

APRIL 1959

VOLUME 41

NUMBER 2

## William Hickling Prescott: Authors' Agent

As a centennial tribute to Prescott, this article is an excursion into mid-nineteenth century American intellectual history, wherein the prominent writer, as he aids fellow American authors, contributes to the internationalization of the nascent American literature. Before his death on January 28, 1859, in the years of his literary maturity, while the public was avidly reading his multi-volume histories and his publishers impatiently awaited his unfinished manuscripts, ever generous William Hickling Prescott repeatedly assisted friends desirous of marketing their literary wares.

The aid which he extended Madame Calderón de la Barca was but the logical outcome of Prescott's continuing concern about that lady's knowledge of Mexico. They had been friends in Boston before Scotch-born Frances Inglis had married Spanish diplomat Angel Calderón de la Barca, likewise before Prescott had seized upon the conquest of Mexico as his own special historical theme. Hence it was natural for the Boston writer to keep in touch with so charming a female correspondent once she moved over the terrain connected with his historical protagonist Hernando Cortés.

One of many Spaniards overjoyed at Prescott's pursuit of Spanish historical themes, Angel Calderón de la Barca was himself dedicated to furthering the Bostonian's search for manuscripts, illustrations, and scholarly connections.<sup>1</sup> As Angel's wife, Fanny would have assisted Prescott; as the historian's personal friend, she had added reason for identifying herself with his projects.

<sup>1</sup> Roger Wolcott (ed.), *The Correspondence of William Hickling Prescott 1833-1847*, Boston and New York, 1925, 24, 84, 92-93, 111, 113. The diplomat's intended translations of successive works by Prescott never materialized.

With long, warm friendly letters of Prescott and both Calderóns moving as regularly as the mails permitted between Boston and Mexico City, it soon became apparent that Fanny Calderón's range of interests and her colorful and engaging accounts, compounded of history and geography as well as contemporary society, could supplement Prescott's own knowledge of Mexico in such fashion as to enrich his detail-laden writing.

On August 15, 1840, by which time the Calderóns had spent eight months in Mexico and Prescott more than two and a half years on the conquest of Mexico, the author put a series of queries to the diplomat's lady:

By the bye, will you be good enough to inform me whether there are any descendants of Montezuma or of the Tezcucan line of monarchs now living in Mexico? Should you visit Tezcuco I hope you will give me some account of the appearance of things there. And I wish you would tell me what kind of trees are found on the table land and in the valley. In describing the march of the Spaniards I am desirous to know what was the appearance of the country through which they passed. . . .

After imaginatively spinning himself onto the Mexican scene, the color-conscious writer from the far northern clime, especially intrigued by the *tierra caliente*, continued, "Is not the road bordered with flowers and the trees bent under a load of parasitical plants of every hue and odour? I should like to get a peep into this paradise."<sup>2</sup>

Invited to do so, as the historian refused to accede to repeated urgings to visit Mexico and see things for himself, Fanny Calderón penned the phrases that gave Prescott the desired peep, along with much else that made Mexico more meaningful to the chair-borne traveler of Boston.

"As for the appearance of the country in the *tierra caliente*," she replied, "you may boldly dip your pen in the most glowing colours. . . ."<sup>3</sup> In addition to endorsing Prescott's disposition to color, she also supplied him with infinite detail.

"Many thanks to you, my dear Madame Calderón, for . . . the rich description you have given me . . .," he countered. "It was what I wanted."<sup>4</sup> In certain passages of Prescott's *Conquest of Mexico* one meets Fanny's contributions.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 150.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 169-170.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 186.

<sup>5</sup> William H. Prescott, *History of the Conquest of Mexico*, 3 vols., New York, 1843, I, 5-9 342; III, 98-99, 332.



In such fashion a well known author became aware of the powers of observation and the literary skill of a friendly correspondent, who in one particularly rambling epistle had declared, "I am afraid you will think I am going to write you a volume, upon the Mexican manners and customs. . . ."<sup>6</sup> Perhaps it was then, possibly earlier, surely not much later, that Prescott came to expect a volume from Fanny's pen.

In addition to those addressed to him, Prescott was aware of Fanny Calderón's letters to her family in the United States. What the letters had meant to him and to them might, it was conjectured, be converted into an interesting and instructive experience for a larger, less intimate audience, the reading public. It required some effort to convert the private letters into public reading material, but such did occur largely because Prescott "strongly recommended that they should be given to the world."<sup>7</sup>

The third logical step for the man who first had partially inspired the letter writing and then had insisted upon publication was that of helping to find a publisher. In Boston this was a routine matter, with an arrangement speedily worked out with Little, Brown and Company, the recently-founded firm that was happily issuing edition after edition of Prescott's *Ferdinand and Isabella*.<sup>8</sup>

While the American edition of the Calderón letters was being readied for the public, the search for an English publisher got underway. In a day in which American authors dedicated special attention to the matter of winning European approbation, such effort was especially to be expected for Madame Calderón's manuscript in consideration of her own British background and Prescott's established reputation abroad. If satisfaction with his American publisher explains the submission of Madame Calderón's manuscript to Little, Brown and Company, it was dissatisfaction with his English publisher that caused him to ignore Richard Bentley at this time.

<sup>6</sup> Wolcott, *Correspondence*, 133.

<sup>7</sup> Madame Calderón de la Barca (Henry Baerlein, ed.), *Life in Mexico during a Residence of Two Years in that Country*, New York, [1931], xxiv.

<sup>8</sup> Between August, 1838, and late 1842 this Boston publisher had issued seven printings of Prescott's work. For the sequence of Prescott's own publications, see the present writer's *William Hickling Prescott: An Annotated Bibliography of Published Works*, Washington, Library of Congress, 1958; for Prescott's relations with his publishers, see the present writer's *Prescott and His Publishers*, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, 1959.

Having met Charles Dickens in Boston early in June, 1842, on which occasion Prescott's suspicions regarding Bentley were enlarged and Dickens' offer of assistance in publishing circles was extended,<sup>9</sup> it was not unnatural for the historian to turn to the novelist. After identifying Fanny Calderón, describing her Mexican experience and evaluating her writing, Prescott wrote, "The favour I have to ask of you is that you will allow me to send her manuscript to you, and that you will offer it to a responsible London publisher to print on the best terms he will offer." Prescott hoped that near simultaneous publication in England and America might come early in 1843.<sup>10</sup>

The complete freedom of action accorded Dickens in the overture of late August was maintained in Prescott's mid-autumn communication. The American would willingly confirm any publishing arrangement that the Englishman might make for the Calderón manuscript.<sup>11</sup> On December 1, 1842, Prescott sent Dickens a pre-publication copy of the text of the first volume, with all of the second volume promised by the beginning of 1843.

With the author's name concealed and only her initials given, a concession to her husband's insistence upon the demands of diplomatic etiquette, Prescott's signed preface played a more significant role than usual in recommending the work to the public. The presumed power of Prescott's modestly phrased one page endorsement is evident in words which he addressed to Dickens: "The publishers may make use of the Preface in advertising the book. . . . They will do so here."<sup>12</sup>

As he forwarded the remainder of the Calderón manuscript to Dickens later in December, Prescott indicated that "Now that I have read the book through more thoroughly I think it must have success."<sup>13</sup> At the end of January, 1843, Prescott informed Dickens that he would be happy to receive any sums that Chapman & Hall, the English publisher of her work, might have for Madam Calderón. As for the American reception of the travel book, the Bostonian reported: "It has had an excellent sale here. . . ."<sup>14</sup>

London, likewise, could report the favorable reception of the book, by both reviewers and reading public. In early March, as

<sup>9</sup> Wolcott, *Correspondence*, 309-310.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 315-316.

<sup>11</sup> Memo dated November 14, 1842, of letter from Prescott to Dickens, William Hickling Prescott Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society (hereinafter cited as P-MHS).

<sup>12</sup> Wolcott, *Correspondence*, 323.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 328.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 329.

Chapman & Hall paid Madame Calderón, via Prescott, the twenty-five pounds agreed upon for the early copy of the American edition, the London publisher expressed two wishes, neither of which materialized: another work from the Calderón pen and an opportunity to publish Prescott in England.<sup>15</sup>

Meanwhile there was one more assist that Prescott could give Fanny Calderón's literary labor: he could review it in a major publication. Although the tempo of his own labors had increased and his outlook had so changed as to consider review writing an utterly worthless endeavor, Prescott seized the opportunity "to give the work a life here."<sup>16</sup> The Boston-based *North American Review*, foremost literary organ in America and the publication in which virtually all of Prescott's onetime welter of reviews had appeared, was the ideal medium. For the January, 1843, issue, which appeared simultaneously with Fanny's book—just as an earlier issue had perfectly paralleled and extensively reviewed Prescott's first book in January, 1838—Prescott composed a review of more than thirty pages. A treatise on travel literature in general and Calderón's *Life in Mexico* in particular, it was a statement of the prejudices and inabilities of most such authors and praise of the understanding and abilities of the author of *Life in Mexico*. Numerous and lengthy quotations were offered, the better to support the reviewer's enthusiasm, illustrate the book's nature, and whet the reader's appetite. Apologetically concluding his essay with the hope that he had indicated the wealth and variety of the work, Prescott insisted that it contained the best spirited portraiture of Mexican society to be found in a travel book.<sup>17</sup>

From beginning to end, Prescott had done everything he could to assist Madame Calderón de la Barca with the publication of *Life in Mexico*. The verdict of history so heartily endorses the worth of the work<sup>18</sup> that appreciation also is due him without whose efforts it probably might never have materialized.

\* \* \*

Six years later Prescott was at the height of his fame: his *Conquest of Mexico* had appeared in December, 1843, the potpourri

<sup>15</sup> Chapman & Hall to Prescott, March 3, 1843, P-MHS.

<sup>16</sup> Wolcott, *Correspondence*, 329.

<sup>17</sup> [William H. Prescott], "Madame Calderón's *Life in Mexico*," *North American Review*, LVI (January, 1843), 137-170.

<sup>18</sup> Reprinted, abridged, and translated repeatedly in the century since its initial appearance, *Life in Mexico* has known and continues to know an appeal unrivalled by any other travel account of independent Mexico.

of his literary essays and extended review articles had become a book in 1845 and two years later, on June 22, 1847, his *Conquest of Peru* had reached the hands of the reading public. Acclaimed on both sides of the Atlantic, with his works translated into several languages, Prescott took a brief rest from the literary labors that had consumed his attention almost uninterruptedly for two decades and in the course of early 1849 again took occasion to peddle the penned product of one of his friends.

Young Samuel Eliot was a Bostonian with multiple claims upon the attention of William Hickling Prescott. Himself a graduate of Harvard, Eliot was son of William Havard Eliot and nephew of Samuel Atkins Eliot, both of whom were and had been literary and social intimates of Prescott since the days of the founding of Club back in 1818.<sup>19</sup> Possessed of literary interests which included a projected multi-volume history of liberty, young Eliot, in his late twenties, became the object of Prescott's special attention when, in 1849, the first part of his history was ready for publication.

With the passage of years that had included the release in England of four of his own works through the house of Richard Bentley, much of the disgruntlement that had punctuated Prescott's earlier relations with his English publisher had yielded to a mellowing trans-Atlantic friendship increasingly evident in the personal portions of the voluminous correspondence that once had been business-like only in tone. Accordingly Bentley became the final piece in the three-piece mosaic consisting of author, agent, and publisher.

"My friend and townsman Mr. Samuel Eliot," the historian wrote the publisher, "has been engaged for sometime in the composition of an historical work of which he has now completed two volumes. He wishes to have the book brought before the English public at the same time that it appears here and I have mentioned you to him. . . ."

Sensing that Bentley would make his own appraisal and reach his own decision, Prescott wasted few words recommending either the writer or the work. "Mr. Eliot is a young man who has a high reputation among us for his talents and literary acquisitions. The work submitted to you is of a comprehensive nature, and—from

<sup>19</sup> George Ticknor, *Life of William Hickling Prescott*, Philadelphia, 1895, 52.

the glance I have had of it—shows scholarship and careful meditation . . . he sends out the printed proofs. . . ."<sup>20</sup>

Eliot's writing evidently pleased Bentley because Prescott, ever one to keep an eye on the announcements of forthcoming publications in England, soon gave the matter his further attention: "I see you have advertised Mr. Eliot's work, and I hope you will not be the loser by it."<sup>21</sup> Eliot's *History of the Liberty of Rome* emerged from Bentley's hands on July 2, 1849, in two garbs, with the price of the two volumes twenty-eight shillings in octavo and five shillings in quarto.<sup>22</sup>

Early the following year Bentley informed Prescott that the Eliot work had not had any success. Reflecting upon that unfortunate state of affairs, the publisher mused that it might have been otherwise had the book known, along with a more attractive title, some felicitous editing by Prescott's able hand. Suggestive that Bentley sustained no loss was his willingness to publish Eliot's *History of the Early Christians*, part two of his project, on September 26, 1853. Though revised and republished in America, Eliot's work was not the masterpiece in its field that Madame Calderón's swiftly became.<sup>23</sup>

\* \* \*

Two years passed, during which Prescott, for a variety of reasons, continued to remain largely outside the routine of productive scholarship. In the spring of 1850 he mustered sufficient courage to undertake the trip that fulfilled his oft-made promise to visit England. For more than three months, from early June until mid-September, historian Prescott was lionized by British society in a manner unrivalled by any other private American citizen. As he capitalized upon the past achievements that spelled literary fame for him in England and hurriedly cast an eye to the future while speeding through Holland, the land so significant to his promised history of Philip the Second of Spain, it was a momentous season back home, that one in which Clay, Webster, Calhoun and others

<sup>20</sup> Prescott to Richard Bentley, February 9, 1849, Richard Bentley Papers, Harvard University (hereinafter cited as B-HU). Eliot's work was published by G. P. Putnam of New York in 1849.

<sup>21</sup> Prescott to Bentley, April 20, 1849, B-HU.

<sup>22</sup> [Richard Bentley and Son], *A List of the Principal Publications Issued from New Burlington Street During the Year 1849*, London, 1897, unnumbered p. 29.

<sup>23</sup> Bentley to Prescott, February 7, 1850, P-MHS. A representative negative estimate of Eliot's work may be found in "Retrospective Survey of American Literature," *The Westminster Review*, LVII (January, 1852), 159.



heatedly debated the issues contained in successive segments of the Compromise of 1850.

At mid-century, as Prescott paused in his historical production, another Bostonian, Francis Parkman, made his meteoric rise. Though both Parkman and Prescott were physically handicapped, intensely interested in history, and came of wealthy and socially prominent families, the differences between them were also noteworthy. Prescott was old enough to be Parkman's father; their subject matter differed greatly both in time and space; and many of their approaches to historical method as well as their styles of writing showed marked dissimilarity. However, with the breadth of interests that characterized Prescott's intellectual life, it was inevitable that he would know and formulate an estimate of the man who had published *Oregon Trail* in the late 1840's and had his *History of the Conspiracy of Pontiac* ready for the press with the dawning of the next decade.

One of Prescott's intimates, Parkman's old history professor Jared Sparks, read the manuscript in March, 1850, and reported favorably on it. In June the Reverend George E. Ellis, another long-term acquaintance of Prescott, undertook to find an American publisher for Parkman. Garbed in an array of optional and equally clumsy titles, the well-written work on a secondary American historical theme was received coolly at Harpers where the Prescott precedent suggested that an author should have his work stereotyped at his own expense before entering into negotiations with a publisher. After the rebuff in New York, Parkman had his manuscript stereotyped, contracting later for its publication by Little, Brown and Company.<sup>24</sup>

Like many other American authors of his day, Parkman desired simultaneous publication in England and America. To assist his young friend beyond the Atlantic, Prescott wrote Richard Bentley:

My friend Mr. Parkman, of this city, proposes to send out by this steamer the proofsheets of a new work of his relating to the occupation of this country by the French, and their intercourse with the Indians. His work leads him largely into an account of these sons of the forest, for which, as you are probably aware, he is better qualified than any good writer among us by his residence with them. I have seen some hundred and fifty pages of the book, and it seems to me to be written with much spirit, with many picturesque descriptions and stirring incidents—told in a skilful manner, that I should think would engage the interest of the

<sup>24</sup> Mason Wade, *Francis Parkman, Heroic Historian*, New York, 1942, 306-308.



reader. The rare materials from which the story is drawn gives it still higher value in an historical view. I cannot tell how much curiosity the English reader would feel in this portion of American History, or how far such a work would be a good book in the sense of the *trade*. I believe, from the specimen I have seen, it will prove a good book in every other sense, and as such, if you think it for your interest—of which you are much the best judge—I hope you will be able to make some arrangement with Mr. Parkman for the publication of it.<sup>25</sup>

This was not Bentley's introduction to Parkman. Indeed the London publisher had so enthused over the *Oregon Trail* that he had published an edition of it, only to find that the English reading public did not share his enthusiasm.<sup>26</sup> Now, a few years later, as Prescott brought the two together once more, his was essentially a job of reestablishing Bentley's enthusiasm. Prescott's letter surely helped on that score, for his own enthusiasm was so fulsome as to be contagious.

Thanking Prescott for bringing author and publisher together, Bentley quickly warmed to Parkman's new book. He wrote:

I have looked into it, and am much interested by the picturesque narrative. I judge that others will not fail to be interested in his work, and therefore in my letter to him by this packet I have acquainted him that I accept with pleasure the offer he has been so good as to make me of publishing it in England.<sup>27</sup>

Published in America in September, 1851, and released in England by Bentley somewhat earlier on August 21, the *History of the Conspiracy of Pontiac*, in two volumes, priced at 21 shillings, was no success beyond the water, for Bentley disposed of only 153 copies of a 500-copy edition in a period of twelve months.<sup>28</sup> Nevertheless, and despite the English reaction to Parkman, Prescott had helped to put another historical masterwork before a larger audience.

\* \* \*

In the spring of 1852 Prescott's helping hand was extended in behalf of an author who neither needed nor sought his assistance. Published initially in weekly instalments in the *National Era* between June 5, 1851 and April 1, 1852, the abolitionist novel, *Uncle*

<sup>25</sup> Prescott to Bentley, May 20, 1851, B-HU.

<sup>26</sup> Wade, *Parkman*, 299.

<sup>27</sup> Bentley to Prescott, June 19, 1851, P-MHS.

<sup>28</sup> Wade, *Parkman*, 308; and [Richard Bentley and Son], *A List of the Principal Publications Issued from New Burlington Street During the Year 1851*, London, 1902, unnumbered p. 57. However, English reviews supported Bentley's judgment; see "Contemporary Literature in America," *Westminster Review*, LVII (January, 1852), 167-168.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

*Tom's Cabin*, seemingly did not attract Prescott's attention until released in book form in Boston on March 20, 1852, by publisher John P. Jewett.

The "puff" he tried to give it was unnecessary in the whirlwind of acclaim rapidly bestowed on *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. "Three thousand copies were sold the very first day, a second edition was issued the following week, a third on the first of April," wrote the author's son, "and within a year one hundred and twenty editions, or over three hundred thousand copies of the book, had been issued and sold in this country."<sup>29</sup>

Ten weeks after this auspicious American debut in book form, Prescott penned Richard Bentley:

... my object in writing to you now is to mention a book I have lately been reading, and which has had an immense circulation in this country—"Uncle Tom's Cabin." It is a novel in two volumes written by a lady, the wife of a Calvinistic divine, who lived many years in the Southern States, and has exhibited in this novel the character of our South and the social condition of slavery. It is sketched with great strength and truth of coloring, in scenes very touching—some of them comic—and the whole story written in a very piquant attractive manner. I know nothing of the writer personally; but it has occurred to me more than once that the book could not fail to be popular in England; so that I have already sent two copies to friends there.

If you wish it, I suppose you can get a copy of the American book-sellers—Putnam's for instance—in London. Or if you desire it, I will send you one.<sup>30</sup>

Bentley was much interested and Prescott played middleman in the fruitless exchange that developed. When the publisher, hoping for a second book to exploit the popularity of the writer's name, penned an expression of his interest, Prescott forwarded it to Mrs. Stowe, who, in turn, wrote the historian a letter laden with queries about foreign copyright. Relaying Mrs. Stowe's word that she had another work in progress, Prescott quoted her to Bentley, "And as far as I know, I think I would like to engage Mr. Bentley as publisher, although I am not yet prepared to enter into immediate negotiation." The historian informed both the novelist and the publisher that he stood ready to assist, should they prefer to communicate through him.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>29</sup> Charles Edward Stowe (comp.), *Life of Harriet Beecher Stowe compiled from Her Letters and Journals*, Boston and New York, 1889, 160.

<sup>30</sup> Prescott to Bentley, June 6, 1852, B-HU.

<sup>31</sup> *Id.* to *Id.*, October 11, 1852, B-HU; and Bentley to Prescott, October 26, 1852, P-MHS.

By late November it was evident that Prescott had not brought author and publisher to terms, for he wrote Bentley, "I am sorry that my correspondence with Mrs. Stowe has had no better result, as I see her next work advertised by some publisher—I forget whom—in the English papers." In a parting word about her to Bentley, Prescott offered a succinct single sentence judgment: "Her literary adventure is a miracle, for in a twinkling 'Uncle Tom' has shot up into a celebrity equal to that reached by the best of Scott's novels, while in point of literary execution merely, it is not equal to the worst."<sup>32</sup>

English publishers, seizing the opportunity to accord an American author the treatment so often dealt English writers on this side of the Atlantic, produced a confusion of pirated editions of the famed novel. Within twelve months of its initial appearance in England, which incidentally antedated Prescott's first letter to Bentley about it, *Uncle Tom's Cabin* passed through forty editions at the hands of eighteen different London publishers.<sup>33</sup>

A few years later, by which time both the historian and the novelist were under contract to Phillips, Sampson and Company of Boston, their literary paths casually crossed once more. From his autumn retreat at Pepperell, Prescott, on October 4, 1856, penned Mrs. Stowe a letter of appreciation for the copy of her novel *Dred* which publisher Phillips had forwarded to him. Among his reactions to the book, he insisted, "But Nina, to my mind, is the true hero of the book, which I should have named after her instead of 'Dred.'"<sup>34</sup> Prescott was not alone in his opinion and on occasion the book was reprinted under that suggested title.

\* \* \*

In the latter part of 1853 Prescott, calling the attention of both English reader and English publisher to a work by George S. Hillard, repaid numerous kindnesses extended him by another longtime friend. Hillard, reviewing Prescott's first book for the *Boston Courier*, had declared:

The first qualities in an historical work are accuracy and thoroughness, and these it possesses to an extent which leaves nothing to be desired, and puts

<sup>32</sup> Prescott to Bentley, November 26, 1852, 852, B-HU.

<sup>33</sup> Stowe (comp.), *Life of Harriet Beecher Stowe*, 190. Many of these editions are listed in *The English Catalogue of Books published from January, 1835 to January, 1863*, London, 1864, 740-741. Bentley published a 3s. 6d. edition on September 29, 1852; see [Richard Bentley and Son], *A List of the Principal Publications Issued from New Burlington Street During the Year 1852*, London, 1903, unnumbered p. 61.

<sup>34</sup> Stowe (comp.), *Life of Harriet Beecher Stowe*, 311.

it upon a level with Gibbon's *Rome* and Hallam's *Middle Ages*. It is undoubtedly the most learned historical work that has appeared in our country. . . . That it will take a permanent rank, as a classic, in the language, may be predicted with perfect confidence.<sup>35</sup>

Two days later Prescott, reveling in the reception given his *Ferdinand and Isabella*, stamped Hillard's praise "as much to my taste as anything that has appeared."<sup>36</sup> Six years later, in a long and beautifully phrased article for the *North American Review*, Hillard reviewed the *Conquest of Mexico* and in so doing placed additional laurels upon the literary brow of his friend.<sup>37</sup>

With the passage of years, during which he practiced law, travelled widely and maintained his interest in literature, Hillard came to pen his *Six Months in Italy*. Prescott's enthusiasm for the work led him to press for English reception of it on two fronts. In mid-September, 1853, he sent copies of the work, accompanied by a praise-laden letter, to his friend Mrs. H. H. Milman, wife of the English literary critic.<sup>38</sup> Another England-bound copy of Hillard's book went to publisher John Murray. Prompted by the harsh realities that stamped the Italian theme as hackneyed, Murray initially entertained serious doubts. However, his study of the book so convinced him that Prescott's praise of it was justified that he hastened, without further ado, to reprint it in an English edition of 1,000 copies. Writing Prescott of his course of action, which included promise of half profits for the author, the publisher asked the historian to inform Hillard of the conditions on which he had reprinted the work.<sup>39</sup>

Time proved that this product of the author's travels of 1847-1848 was another Prescott-backed winner because in less than three years it knew five American editions. Long accepted as a standard work among travelers' guide books, it eventually appeared in more than twenty editions.

\* \* \*

Within the small class in which Prescott graduated from Harvard in 1814 was modest, gentle Thomas Bulfinch. After a brief teaching career, bachelor Bulfinch turned, in his later adult life, to clerking in the Merchants' Bank of Boston. However, he never turned

<sup>35</sup> *Boston Courier*, January 4, 1838.

<sup>36</sup> Ticknor, *Prescott*, 109.

<sup>37</sup> *North American Review*, LVIII (January, 1844), 157-210.

<sup>38</sup> Ticknor, *Prescott*, 360.

<sup>39</sup> John Murray to Prescott, December 8, 1853, P-MHS.

his back on his literary interests. Maturing late as a writer, Bulfinch dotted the 1850's with successive titles which he offered the reading public, with fables, legends, chivalry, and mythology commanding his attention.

With one volume behind him, Bulfinch had another ready for some publisher's consideration when Prescott, on December 28, 1853, addressed Bentley:

A friend of mine, Mr. Bulfinch, of this town, has now in the press a work relating to Ancient Mythology so explained and illustrated as to adapt it to the use of families—which is rather a delicate task. Mr. B. has already produced a volume which has met with much commendation; and from what I know of his character and abilities I cannot doubt that his forthcoming work will be well adapted to the purposes for which it is designed.

As Mr. Bulfinch is desirous of being put in communication with an English publisher, I have thought I could not do better than by introducing him to you, and I shall be most happy if when you have seen his work, you shall find it so well suited to the English market as to allow of your publication of it.<sup>40</sup>

Less than a week later, while reporting his own progress on the first two volumes of *Philip the Second*, Prescott adverted to Bulfinch in a manner which suggested that qualms of conscience prodded him. He had written the earlier letter at Bulfinch's request and indeed expected his friend to produce a fine book but one thing he plainly wished known was the fact that he had never seen the work.<sup>41</sup>

Bulfinch's book seemingly was not published immediately in England, by Bentley nor anyone else, but *The Age of Fable*, the item concerned, did prove to be Bulfinch's finest work. His effort to widen the audience for mythology knew considerable success, with the work passing through several editions and gaining a reputation that still classes it as a standard reference in its field.<sup>42</sup>

\* \* \*

Between Prescott and Boston-born John Lothrop Motley stretched a slender, yet significant, intellectual relationship. Motley, much the younger, was born the year that Prescott concluded his formal education at Harvard. Like Prescott, Motley traveled abroad, di-

<sup>40</sup> Prescott to Bentley, December 28, 1853, B-HU.

<sup>41</sup> *Id.* to *id.*, January 2, 1854, B-HU.

<sup>42</sup> A. Johnson *et al* (eds.), *Dictionary of American Biography*, 21 vols., New York, 1928-1944, III, 247-248.



vided his intellectual interests between literature and history, came of a family of means and outlook which permitted his concentration on not overly remunerative intellectual endeavors, and, finally, centered his historical interests upon a theme far removed from the American scene.

The intellectual paths of the two men first came together in the late 1840's. Motley had begun collecting materials about 1846 for a history of the Netherlands, at which time Prescott was concluding his *Conquest of Peru*. Despite the fact that he had neither studied nor written as yet on the period of Philip the Second of Spain, Prescott's long-range intentions already included that subject in his ultimate array of historical studies. For years book dealers, diplomats, and scholars had laboriously been drawing together the materials upon which Prescott would eventually base his study of late sixteenth-century Spain.<sup>43</sup>

Interested in the Dutch sector of Spanish history in that and the following century, Motley found himself in a position similar to that in which Prescott had been in 1838-1839 in reference to Washington Irving and the conquest of Mexico. Then Irving, Prescott's senior in years and reputation, had graciously stepped aside to allow the Bostonian complete freedom of action in his exploitation of the Mexican theme. Indeed Irving had given Prescott some assistance as well as much encouragement.<sup>44</sup>

As Prescott had manfully approached Irving, so Motley came to Prescott. Whereas Prescott had corresponded with Irving, Motley took his case to Prescott in person. In 1847, at which time their personal acquaintance with each other was slight,<sup>45</sup> Prescott and Motley discussed their hopes and plans. Pleased and cooperative, Prescott saw no reason why Motley should not proceed with his project. The generosity of the senior historian was doubly evident as he offered his junior any books which he owned that pertained to Motley's research. For Prescott it was but a small kindness extended; for Motley it was so momentous a gesture that

<sup>43</sup> Wolcott, *Correspondence*, *passim* and Clara Louisa Penney (ed.), *Prescott, Unpublished Letters to Gayangos*, New York, Hispanic Society of America, 1927, *passim* illustrate this activity with basic correspondence. See also the present writer's article, "Prescott's Most Indispensable Aide: Pascual de Gayangos," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXXIX (February, 1959), 81-115.

<sup>44</sup> Ticknor, *Prescott*, 156-163.

<sup>45</sup> With Motley publishing romances in this period, their contacts probably were simply within the whirl of Boston society; see Susan and Herbert St. John Mildmay (eds.), *John Lothrop Motley and His Family*, London and New York, 1910, 28.



it constituted a turning-point in his life.<sup>46</sup> Almost a decade passed before either man published a book related to the theme of their overlapping interest.

Pre-publication problems occupied both Prescott and Motley in the autumn of 1855. Promise of the most lucrative contract that he had ever known had led Prescott to turn from Harpers to Phillips, Sampson and Company of Boston. Nonetheless his parting from the New York house, his publisher for more than a decade, was friendly. When Thomas Motley, Jr., in the absence of his author-brother, John Lothrop, who was still in Europe, decided to peddle that historian's wares in New York, Prescott obligingly addressed a warm letter of introduction on his behalf to the Harpers.

As he has been living in the midst of the scenes he describes, and with the best materials at his command," Prescott wrote of John Lothrop Motley, "his works cannot fail to be of the most authentic character. Although I have not seen the manuscript, yet I cannot doubt, from his high parts and brilliant and attractive style, that his book will be one of great interest and importance. I hope therefore that you will give it a careful examination, and that he will be able to make an arrangement with you which will be satisfactory to both."<sup>47</sup>

Three months later, on December 10, 1855, Prescott's American publisher issued the first two volumes of his *Philip the Second*. Like other histories by Prescott, this was preceded by a lengthy prefatory statement of his theme, the materials upon which he had based it, and words of appreciation to scholars who had assisted him. Cognizant of his co-worker's forthcoming work, Prescott wrote: "... the Revolution of the Netherlands, although strictly speaking, only an episode to the main body of the narrative, from its importance well deserves to be treated in a separate and independent narrative by itself." Amplifying this point in a footnote, he continued:

It is gratifying to learn that before long such a history may be expected—if indeed it should not appear before the publication of this work—from the pen of our accomplished countryman Mr. J. Lothrop Motley, who during the last few years, for the better prosecution of his labors, has established his residence in the neighborhood of the scenes of his narrative. No one acquainted with the fine powers of mind possessed by this scholar, and the earnestness with which he has devoted himself

<sup>46</sup> Ticknor, *Prescott*, 259-261.

<sup>47</sup> J. Henry Harper, *The House of Harper—A Century of Publishing in Franklin Square*, New York, 1912, 140-141.

to his task, can doubt that he will do full justice to his important but difficult subject.<sup>48</sup>

Sensing a good publishing prospect in the offing, Bentley pounced upon the proffered bait. He hurriedly wrote to Prescott:

In a note in the preface to your new history, you mention that Mr. Motley is engaged on a history of the Netherlands. Has that gentleman published his Work? If not, may I ask whether he is at Boston? In that case probably he would do me the favor to negotiate with me for it, if you would kindly ask him.<sup>49</sup>

Early in the spring of 1856, less than five months after the appearance of Prescott's latest work, Motley's *Rise of the Dutch Republic* appeared in both America and England. In America the Prescott assistance was all the more meaningful because Motley's work was accepted and published by the Harpers. In England Prescott's role was less noteworthy. There Motley had trouble finding a publisher, as nothing came of Bentley's early enthusiasm. John Murray declined to publish the work; and finally the author was forced to bring it out through Chapman at his own expense.<sup>50</sup>

Prescott also helped Motley to that equally significant literary commodity, the reading public. The phenomenal sale of the *Rise of the Dutch Republic*, 17,000 copies during the first year of its publication in England, derived from many factors, most important of which was the inherent worth of the work.<sup>51</sup> However, one cannot discount entirely, nor assess fully, the significance of Prescott's assistance. The free advertising and boundless praise in his *Philip the Second* certainly helped to ready the reading public for Motley's work. In addition, the latter basked, to some extent, in the reflected interest that the well-known Prescott had established for its theme through his own writing.<sup>52</sup>

As the success of Prescott's *Conquest of Mexico* had underscored the rightness of the decision by which Irving had stepped aside, so Motley's achievement underscored the worth of the decision that had welcomed a co-worker and quasi-competitor to the field which Prescott had staked out for his own historical digging. Motley had his American publisher send a presentation copy to Prescott, who acknowledged it in a heart-warming letter dated

<sup>48</sup> William H. Prescott, *History of the Reign of Philip the Second, King of Spain*, 2 vols., Boston, Phillips, Sampson and Co., 1855, I, xii.

<sup>49</sup> Bentley to Prescott, November 23, 1855, P-MHS.

<sup>50</sup> Mildmay, *Motley and Family*, 57-58.

<sup>51</sup> George William Curtis (ed.), *The Correspondence of John Lothrop Motley*, 2 vols., New York, 1889, I, 190.

<sup>52</sup> For Motley's awareness of this, see Mildmay, *Motley and Family*, 53.

April 28, 1856. Among a succession of friendly sentiments and words of praise, possibly the finest constituted those which read, "... you have more than fulfilled the prediction which I had made respecting your labours to the public. Everywhere you seem to have gone into the subject with a scholarlike thoroughness of research, furnishing me on my own beaten track with a quantity of new facts and views..."<sup>53</sup> In a very real sense Prescott's continuing study of *Philip the Second* probably was enriched by Motley's work. Even in this limited realm of author relationships, all had not been unilateral, for through Prescott surely gave Motley greater assistance than he received from him, it was a relationship possessed of reciprocal advantages.

\* \* \*

In mid-spring 1858, less than a year before his death, Prescott initiated what was probably his last literary assistance to a fellow author. This time the recipient of his attentive support was a friend and neighbor of long standing, John Gorham Palfrey.

Boston-born Palfrey, almost exactly Prescott's age, had graduated from Harvard in the class of 1815, along with their mutual friend Jared Sparks. Palfrey's interests included a range of intellectual endeavors for he was successively clergyman, editor, politician, and historian. Like Prescott, Palfrey had a long-term identification with the *North American Review*, both contributing to it during the editorship of Sparks. In 1835 Palfrey bought the publication and operated it successfully until 1843, when he sold it. During those years Prescott published seven items in the Palfrey-owned organ.<sup>54</sup>

Recovering from his apoplectic stroke of February, 1858, and leisurely putting the third volume of his *Philip the Second* through the press at a moment when national depression tempered any author's enthusiasm for launching his literary product, Prescott, penning a letter to Richard Bentley on a multiplicity of subjects, wrote:

A friend of mine, Dr. Palfrey... will publish this autumn the first volume of a History of New England Puritans, in a couple of volumes, I believe.

<sup>53</sup> Curtis, *Correspondence*, I, 191. In the spring of 1857 Prescott was busy inducing his Spanish friend and aide Pascual de Gayangos to assist Motley with his continuing research; see Penney, *Prescott, Unpublished Letters*, 126-127.

<sup>54</sup> *Dictionary of American Biography*, XIV, 169-170; and William Charvat and Michael Kraus, *William Hickling Prescott; Representative Selections*, New York, [1943], cxxxii-cxxxiii.

It will, I doubt not, be an able and learned book. Whether the theme will interest the English reader you can judge better than I.<sup>55</sup>

Six weeks later Prescott's correspondence with Bentley found him returning to Palfrey:

This note will be handed to you by my friend Mr. Bowen, formerly the Editor of the *North American Review* and now a professor in Harvard University, Cambridge. Mr. Bowen wishes to converse with you about a historical work of our mutual friend Mr. Palfrey, of Cambridge, with whose literary reputation you are doubtless acquainted and of whom I wrote to you in my last. I shall be glad if it suits your views to make an arrangement with Mr. Palfrey for the publication of his book. It cannot fail to be an important one, as the writer has explored the best sources of information to which he has had free access, in England as well as here, and his ability and thorough scholarship eminently fit him for the task. Mr. Bowen, however, can give you many more particulars about Mr. Palfrey's work and the progress made in it than I can; and I will only add that we have no critic among us whose opinion on a subject of this nature is entitled to greater weight than that of Mr. Bowen.<sup>56</sup>

In mid-August, at which moment Prescott initiated negotiations looking forward to the sale and publication of the third volume of his *Philip the Second*, the gentleman-scholar of Boston could still preface a letter dealing with such compelling personal interests with expressions of concern about his friend's manuscript.<sup>57</sup>

Failing to effect an arrangement between Palfrey and Bentley, Prescott turned in his friend's behalf, just as he had several years earlier in pursuit of his own interests, from Bentley to Routledge. On December 9, 1858, within seven weeks of his death, Prescott wrote a laudatory covering note to accompany the synopsis of the history of New England which Palfrey sent for Routledge's consideration.<sup>58</sup> Prescott could do no more; he lay in his grave before Palfrey's work finally found a London publisher.<sup>59</sup>

\* \* \*

Between the early 1840's and the closing weeks of his life, Prescott extended, for a variety of reasons, special assistance to these

<sup>55</sup> Prescott to Bentley, May 3, 1858, B-HU.

<sup>56</sup> *Id.* to *id.*, June 18, 1858, B-HU. Bowen had reviewed Prescott's *Conquest of Peru* in the *North American Review*, LXV (October, 1847), 366-400.

<sup>57</sup> Prescott to Bentley, August 13, 1858, B-HU.

<sup>58</sup> Prescott to Routledge, December 9, 1858, P-MHS.

<sup>59</sup> Published in London in 1859, the first two volumes of Palfrey's masterwork were issued by Low; see *The English Catalogue of Books... 1835-1863*, 580.

eight: Madame Calderón de la Barca, Samuel Eliot, Francis Parkman, Harriet Beecher Stowe, George S. Hillard, Thomas Bulfinch, John Lothrop Motley, and John Gorham Palfrey. What opened this facet of the historian's intellectual life?

Did Prescott try to facilitate the publication of their works because of penetrating appraisals he had made? Admittedly he knew and was much interested in the Calderón de la Barca theme and, after reading her work thoroughly, endorsed it in superlative terms. But for the fuller array of works, it can be said he neither knew the themes nor the specific works in minute detail. He freely admitted that he had but glanced at Eliot's writing on Roman liberty. Aside from the demands of his own work schedule, one suspects that Prescott's unfamiliarity with the theme constituted a basic reason for his not giving the work more attention. Parkman's subject, despite its parallels to his own Mexican and Peruvian studies thematically and stylistically, was unfamiliar to him. Prescott based his very enthusiastic endorsement of Parkman on a reading of a minor part of the book. Of Stowe's subject Prescott, never known to have traveled south of the Potomac, knew little, but had thought much. Once he had read *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, it was kinship of spirit that drew from the historian the unsolicited urge to aid the already successful novelist. The Whig historian, who counted anti-slavery spokesmen like Daniel Webster and Charles Sumner among his warm personal friends and long-term correspondents, was a staunch adherent to the abolitionist philosophy of his age.<sup>60</sup> Love of Italy, rather than knowledge of Hillard's manuscript, probably prompted the historian's support of that work. Never did Prescott's request that Bentley consider Bulfinch's work on mythology include any assurance that he had seen, much less read and approved, the work. With Motley working on a theme close to his heart and doing so in the workman-like fashion that further endorsed the eventual product of his labors, Prescott, without laying eyes on the work, paid Motley's history an unusual compliment as he praised it in anticipation. Of Palfrey's work on the history of their mutually beloved home area of New England, Prescott said nothing suggestive of real acquaintance with the penned product of his friend. In the analysis of subjects involved

<sup>60</sup> Illustrative of this aspect of Prescott's nature is Fulmer Mood and Granville Hicks (eds), "Letters to Dr. Channing on Slavery and the Annexation of Texas, 1837," *New England Quarterly*, V (July, 1932), 587-601.



and Prescott's knowledge of them in general and of the specific writings in particular, no common denominator of concern emerges.

Apparently the historian's endorsements derived more basically from personal friendship than from scholarly evaluation. With a single exception all the authors were New Englanders by birth, most of them Bostonians. And the lone non-New Englander, Madame Calderón de la Barca, was a Bostonian by adoption. Though the ingredients of which the various friendships were compounded varied somewhat, some similarities and patterns do appear. Bulfinch and Palfrey, writing on themes vastly removed from Prescott's own interests, were fellow-Bostonians and fellow-Harvard graduates of the same age as the historian. Motley, Eliot, and Parkman, all Bostonians and Harvardmen, were of another generation, the oldest of the trio born the year Prescott left Harvard and the youngest twenty-seven years his junior. Hillard, another Harvard man, fell between these groups in point of age. Plainly the friendships, derived in part from social and economic circles, transcended narrow age categories because of the common element of intellectual endeavor related to creative writing.

Prescott's letters calling the attention of publishers to the works of his friends invariably identified them clearly as such. Quite probably, even as he did everything humanly possible to win initial consideration for the labors of his friends, Prescott said as little as he did about the works concerned because he might have felt that his judgment would be discounted by the publisher. In the name of friendship Prescott went the limit; on the score of literary worth he often refrained from offering any comment, much less judgment. Loyal to his friends, Prescott seemed intent upon helping them breach the barrier of publisher indifference. Interestingly and logically related is the fact that Prescott never bothered to assist any person a second time.

Charged, in the choice of his own historical themes, with being out of step with the surging nationalism of his day,<sup>61</sup> Prescott, in his interest in the contemporary literary products of numerous fellow Americans, exhibited his peculiarly patrician pattern of nationalistic sentiment.

For other writers in other periods and other American communities such widespread, almost indiscriminate, endorsement of

---

<sup>61</sup> Vernon Louis Parrington, *The Romantic Revolution in America 1800-1860*, New York, 1927, 438-439.



one's friends would undoubtedly include a considerable number of literary second-raters and duds. For Prescott, ensconced in the wealth of mid-nineteenth century literary life of Boston, it was otherwise, because he, in his casual, rather than consciously pursued role of authors' agent related himself to the emergence of some of the most noteworthy titles of the period. With the exception of the work by Eliot the literary products of all the authors that Prescott assisted rose to such levels of eminence that they are invariably classified as standard authorities, if not masterworks.

#### C. HARVEY GARDINER

Southern Illinois University

## Theodore Roosevelt and Egyptian Nationalism

On March 14, 1910, ex-President Theodore Roosevelt, fresh from the African game-trails, arrived at Khartoum in the Sudan; by the end of the month he and his party had cleared Egyptian waters for Naples and the next leg of the famous "Teddyssey." During this fortnight sojourn in Egypt and the Sudan Roosevelt found himself in searing contact with the developing problems of imperialism and nationalism in the Middle East. These were problems which, not unnaturally, he was confident he had sure and useful knowledge of, and thus he was prompted to deliver a number of speeches in the nature of both impromptu remarks and formal addresses concerning British policy for administering these colonial areas.<sup>1</sup> An examination of these Egyptian speeches<sup>2</sup> reveals in a singular fashion that Roosevelt was unable to appreciate the large implications of the tensions steadily mounting between the imperialist powers and colonial peoples.<sup>3</sup> His contradictory attitude was based on a conflict between the best interests of the imperialists and the nationalists as he understood Egypt and its future. Long a student of Egyptian affairs<sup>4</sup> Roosevelt's first-hand observations of the people of the Nile exposed him to young nationalism in the

<sup>1</sup> Roosevelt's principal biographers have devoted attention, in varying detail, to the Egyptian episode. See e.g., Henry F. Pringle, *Theodore Roosevelt*, New York, 1956, 360-362; William R. Thayer, *Theodore Roosevelt, An Intimate Biography*, Boston, 1919, 320; Joseph R. Bishop, *Theodore Roosevelt and His Times*, 2 vols. New York, 1920, II, 184, ff. wherein is reprinted the extensive account Roosevelt wrote of his African-European tour in the form of a letter to Sir George Otto Trevelyan.

<sup>2</sup> Roosevelt made three formal speeches on the Egyptian question: "Peace and Order in the Sudan" (Khartoum, March 16, 1910); "Law and Order in Egypt" (Cairo, March 28, 1910); "British Rule in Africa" (London, May 31, 1910). These addresses are reprinted in full in Theodore Roosevelt, *African and European Speeches*, New York, 1910, hereafter cited as *Speeches*. In addition to the foregoing Roosevelt also made a number of shorter talks to various groups in the Sudan and Egypt. The texts of these talks in so far as they are extant have been gathered from various sources.

<sup>3</sup> See in particular Howard K. Beale, *Theodore Roosevelt and the Rise of America as a World Power*, Baltimore, 1956. For example, Beale comments: "He seems never to have comprehended that the more successfully Britain, America and the other powers 'civilized' their colonial peoples, the more certain became the overthrow of the world power he joined Britain in seeking to impose." *Ibid.*, 170.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 164.

raw. The experience was confusing for him. And the result was that his public pronouncements became exhortations to the native population to be better and more useful citizens of their country (not better subjects or wards of the British Crown), and admonitions to the British "to govern or to go" from Egypt.

The interplay of this contradiction is worth examination for several reasons. It demonstrates clearly that Roosevelt had no well thought-out concept of the relationship of imperialism to nationalism as he applied his judgment to a particular case with which he was for a time in contact. This was doubly unfortunate in view of his role as one of the American empire builders and because of the moral authority which as an ex-president he wielded on the popular and official mind at home and abroad. Isolation of the imperialist dilemma of liberty and order is also valuable because it exemplifies the confusion sown in the receptive minds of a would-be national people. Charges of hypocrisy and of democratic cant easily could have been levelled at Roosevelt by any Egyptian leader acquainted with a fair proportion of what he said concerning Egypt and the Sudan. The depth of Western confusion over the nature of imperialism and its ultimate fruits may be measured by the good intentions of Roosevelt in speaking; he sincerely believed in what he said about liberty and order, whatever contradiction might be implicit therein. It is helpful to bear this consideration in mind because it dramatizes one of the sources of distrust between the Powers and colonial peoples.

The Egypt of 1910 like other areas of the colonial world was experiencing the birth pangs of modern nationalism.<sup>5</sup> It was a nationalism its advocates sought to fructify in a national self-government. When so cautious a critic as Lord Cromer<sup>6</sup> could write seriously of rendering "the native Egyptians capable of eventually taking over their share in the government of a really autonomous community,"<sup>7</sup> nationalist opinion, not surprisingly, was demanding independence from the control of Europeans forthwith.

<sup>5</sup> For the Egyptian background see: George Antonius, *The Arab Awakening*, New York, 1938; Evelyn Baring, Lord Cromer, *Modern Egypt*, 2 volumes, New York, 1908; John Marlowe, *Anglo-Egyptian Relations, 1800-1953*, London, 1954; E. W. P. Newman, *Great Britain in Egypt*, London, 1928; George Young, *Egypt*, London, 1927.

<sup>6</sup> Evelyn Baring, Lord Cromer (1841-1917), Agent General in Egypt, 1883-1907.

<sup>7</sup> Cromer, *Modern Egypt*, II, 569; Cromer in his concluding chapter entitled "The Future of Egypt," emphasized the necessarily gradual assumption of self-government by the Egyptians and the need to prepare the native populations to assume power, II, 563-571, *passim*.

It was a nationalism that in a large sense was expressed in terms of "Egypt for the Moslems." It was a nationalism whose extremist elements did not scruple at political murder.<sup>8</sup> On February 10, 1910, Boutros Ghali Pasha, the Prime Minister and a Copt who had a long record of amicable relations with the British Agency, was assassinated by a young Moslem fanatic.<sup>9</sup> Nationalist agitation for a time threatened to disrupt the political balance among Khedive, middle class, and British officialdom which ruled in Egypt. In the backwash of this smoldering unrest aggravated by assassination Theodore Roosevelt arrived in the Sudan.

To the task of pronouncing policy for a restive Egypt Roosevelt brought a firm preconception of the beneficence of European imperialism, and particularly that of Great Britain.<sup>10</sup> His was a somewhat idealized conception of imperialism as the great civilizing agency for the backward peoples of the world. He termed it "Democratic Nationalism," while some like-minded Britishers spoke of it as "Democratic Imperialism."<sup>11</sup> It was something he could believe in, he wrote to Sir Percy Girouard, the governor of Nigeria, with whom he discussed it while stopping at Nairobi,<sup>12</sup> though he

<sup>8</sup> The nationalists included moderate and extremist elements. Extremist opinion was expressed through various secret terrorist groups as well as through newspapers like *El Lewa*. The Constitutional Reform League of Egypt was typical of the moderate factions.

<sup>9</sup> By name Ibrahim Nassif al Wardani, a member of the secret terrorist group "The Mutual Brotherhood." He was apprehended, brought to trial April 21, 1910, found guilty of the assassination and executed June 28, 1910.

<sup>10</sup> This same idea is evident in the following excerpts from his public addresses. "I doubt whether in any other region of the earth there is to be seen more progress, the genuine progress, made by the substitution of civilization for savagery than what we have seen in the Sudan in the past twelve years." "Peace and Justice in the Sudan," *Speeches*, 3. "I have just spent nearly a year in Africa. While there I saw four British protectorates. I grew heartily to respect the men whom I there met, settlers and military and civilian officials.... Your men in Africa are doing a great work for your empire, and they are also doing a great work for civilization." "British Rule in Africa," *ibid*, 159. See also *The New York Times*, March 16, 1910, 1.

<sup>11</sup> Roosevelt to Sir Percy Girouard, July 21, 1910, Roosevelt *Mss.* Roosevelt took his role as witness to events very seriously. "As Sir Edward Grey (whom I greatly like and who thoroughly understands matters) wrote me that I am in the position of an actor who is right in the front of the stage in the full glare of the footlights, but who has no assigned part to play." Roosevelt to Lady Delamere, September 22, 1910, *ibid*. See also Sir George Otto Trevelyan to Roosevelt, October 21, 1911, Bishop, *Theodore Roosevelt*, II, 184.

<sup>12</sup> Roosevelt to Sir Percy Girouard, July 21, 1910, Roosevelt *Mss.* See also Roosevelt to Arthur Lee, August 16, 1910, *ibid*.

was not always convinced of what the outcome would be.<sup>13</sup> Such doubts did not, however, cause him to feel that the attempt to impart the blessings of Western progress to the backward areas should not be made. A striking insight into Roosevelt's attitude in this regard is evident from an address he delivered to a Methodist Conference in Washington, just before he left office in 1909. In these remarks he pointed out:

There is one feature in the expansion of the peoples of the white or European blood during the past four centuries which should never be lost sight of by those who denounce such expansion on moral grounds. On the whole, the movement has been fraught with lasting benefit to most of the people already dwelling in the lands over which the expansion took place. . . . Occasionally although not very frequently, a mild and kindly race has been treated with wanton, brutal and ruthless inhumanity by the white intruders. . . .

There have been very dark spots on the European conquests and control of Africa; but on the whole the African regions which during the past century have seen the greatest cruelty, degradation and suffering, the greatest diminution of population, are those where native control has been unchecked. The advance has been made in the regions under European control or influence. . . .<sup>14</sup>

In short, Roosevelt's mind was cast in the imperialist mold. But it was an imperialism that aimed ultimately at lifting up the non-white races, improving their living conditions, enabling them to have a fuller life. In this great work of human improvement the role of responsible self-government was a crucial one. Roosevelt's domestic political career had been devoted to raising the standards of American life through responsible government, and it is not unexpected that very often in Africa he found himself uttering the same preachments that he had made in America to emphasize this vital need, though the social circumstances of the two peoples were strikingly dissimilar. Many Africans, perhaps

<sup>13</sup> Roosevelt to Sir George Otto Trevelyan, October 1, 1911, *ibid.*

<sup>14</sup> *The Washington Post*, January 19, 1909, 1-2. Lawrence F. Abbot relates the following curious anecdote that throws added light on Roosevelt's understanding of the fruits of civilization and the progress of mankind. The ex-president was inspecting some Egyptian ruins when it took place. "One series of carvings presented the picture of a law court in which a witness was being horribly tortured in the presence of the judge to extort a confession. 'I wish,' said Colonel Roosevelt, 'that those pessimists who believe that civilization is not making steady progress could see this carving. Here is a king portraying as one of the virtues of his reign a state of vicious cruelty which would not have been tolerated by Tammany Hall in its worst days of corruption.'" "Mr. Roosevelt in Egypt," *Outlook*, XCIV (April 30, 1910), 979-982, especially 981.



likewise oblivious to these differences, welcomed the ex-president as an apostle of constitutional government.<sup>15</sup>

\* \* \*

For the enthusiastic young Egyptian who heard Theodore Roosevelt as the voice of one of the great nations, it would have been impossible not to have glimpsed a vision of the new Egypt, the new nation, of which the ex-President spoke and which in truth he exhorted his listeners to help create. Basic to the new Egypt was a new, westernized Egyptian, an individual who was capable of helping himself and thereby performing the work of a good citizen. Roosevelt wanted to see the graduate of Egyptian schools

prepared to do his work in some capacity in civil life, without regard to any aid whatever received from or any salary drawn from the Government. If a man is a good engineer, a good mechanic, a good agriculturist, if he is trained so that he becomes a really good merchant, he is, in his place, the best type of citizen.<sup>16</sup>

This was the way of Europe and America and it must be the way of Africa.<sup>17</sup> One hears distinct echoes of Roosevelt's classic American plainsman as he encourages the youth of the Nile to become "men who will be able to shift for themselves, to help themselves and to help others, fully independent of all matters connected with the Government."<sup>18</sup> "There is only one way a man can permanently be helped, and that is by helping him to help himself", he warned the young people of Africa.<sup>19</sup> The active life of con-

<sup>15</sup> "We Egyptians anticipated the arrival of the ex-President of the United States with great pleasure and impatience, for all Egyptians believed him the best representative of the great American nation, and they still consider that the Americans are the greatest nation in civilization of the present time and that they are the best friends of liberty in as much as in that country constitutional principles have received their widest development." Sheikh Ali Youssef, "Egypt's Reply to Colonel Roosevelt," *The North American Review*, CXCI (June, 1910), 729.

<sup>16</sup> "Peace and Justice in the Sudan," *Speeches*, 5. Even in Lord Cromer's time the educated Egyptian relied heavily upon governmental employment. Thereby evolved a considerable pressure group for expanded subsidies to the very people who were among the most vocal nationalists. At the Luxor Mission *The New York Times* quoted Roosevelt as saying that he wanted education "directed at making a man able to care for himself and for those dependent on him." *The New York Times*, March 24, 1910, 4.

<sup>17</sup> "Peace and Justice in the Sudan," *Speeches*, 6.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 5-6.

<sup>19</sup> Roosevelt at the Luxor Mission, *The New York Times*, March 22, 1910, 5.



stant growth and increasing knowledge, the stock-in-trade of shibboleth of "T.R." at home, was readily declared to a people yearning to assert itself. He asked the members of one audience at Khartoum, for example, not to close their minds or books once school had been left behind, but to keep training, keep educating themselves so that instead of standing still, great progress, "good work, better work" could be accomplished.<sup>20</sup> This was a familiar Western creed which as practiced in Europe and the United States had contributed much to the making of the nation-state.

One of the truly decisive means available to the Egyptians for bringing about a new nation was education. Roosevelt's views of the worth of training people sufficiently so that they might help themselves have already been indicated. But he also took occasion to remind the Egyptians of the function of education in the larger sense, and the place of the University as the best means of expressing a country's ideals. For one thing they must not simply imitate Western universities; rather, Roosevelt entreated, you must "copy what is good in them but test in a critical spirit whatever you take, so as to be sure that you take only what is wisest and best for yourselves."<sup>21</sup> A critical spirit of inquiry, however, was not calculated to enhance British popularity in many quarters of the Egypt of 1910; but Roosevelt failed to relate theory and facts as a first step toward a logical and coherent attitude on the Egyptian question. That he had in mind a University whose impact should be felt in many phases of the peoples' lives is amply borne out by the following words of the Cairo address at the National University:

This university should have a profound influence on all things educational, social, economic and industrial throughout this whole region, because the very fact of Egypt's present position is such that this university will enjoy a freedom hitherto unparalleled in the investigation and testing out of all problems vital to the future of the people of the Orient.<sup>22</sup>

It was to be a University "fraught with literally untold possibilities" for the good of the country.<sup>23</sup>

Closely tied to the free National University advocated by Theodore Roosevelt was the privileged status of the country's press. Western struggles for liberty very often had revolved around freedom of the newspapers to criticize the government. Roosevelt, good

<sup>20</sup> "Peace and Justice in the Sudan," *Speeches*, 9.

<sup>21</sup> "Law and Order in Egypt," *ibid.*, 19.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 16.

democrat that he was, would not insist upon a free press for Europeans and Americans and a muzzled press for native peoples.<sup>24</sup> At Shepherd's Hotel where he stayed while in Cairo he held a press interview to which were invited representatives of the local newspapers. Some fourteen native editors attended; suitably enough the group reflected various shadings of nationalist political opinion. In discussing their responsibility as editors Roosevelt addressed them very much as he would have spoken to a similar gathering of newspapermen in the American midwest:

I always tell the newspaper men in my own country that they are using one of the most formidable weapons of modern life, and that it is vital to see that they use it for good purposes and not for bad purposes.

The correspondent or editor of a newspaper is in reality a public servant.<sup>25</sup>

Yet a free press in Egypt would have certainly included elements agitating for the withdrawal of British forces from the country and the establishment of a national government. Many Egyptian editors would have felt remiss in their duty as public servants to have written otherwise. According to a first-hand account furnished by Ali Youssef, editor of *El Garida*, one of the moderate nationalist organs, Roosevelt quite expected that any rebuke he should choose to give the nationalists over the death of Boutros Pasha would receive some adverse comment from the press.<sup>26</sup> Yet, as an American nurtured on the tradition of an uncontrolled press this did not disturb him. On the contrary, it was natural to him. In Africa as in America! His vision of the modern Egypt included as a matter of course a responsible press free to criticize.<sup>27</sup>

The kind of society in which the modern Egyptian should expect to find himself was a Western one in many of its aspects. Before the

<sup>24</sup> The Press Law of 1881 enabled the Government to suppress newspapers for criticism unfavorable to government policy. This law was put into effect after the death of Boutros Pasha.

<sup>25</sup> *The New York Times*, March 28, 1910, 1. *The Daily Mail* (London), March 28, 1910, 5, carried a glamorized account of the same interview.

<sup>26</sup> Ali Youssef has quoted Roosevelt at the press interview as remarking: "I do not want newspaper men to dictate to me. I am going to speak tomorrow in the Egyptian University. Wait till you hear what I shall say and then say what you wish to say." "Egypt's Reply to Colonel Roosevelt," *loc. cit.*, 732.

<sup>27</sup> Professor Nathaniel Schmidt, Chairman of the Department of Oriental Languages and Literature at Cornell University and himself a long time resident of Egypt remarked in criticism of Roosevelt's Cairo address: "'As for freedom of speech, they have got to have it. It is in the blood.'" *The New York Times*, March 31, 1910, 5.

National University Roosevelt insisted on the practical, technical, industrial foundation of a healthy country. "The base, the foundation of healthy life in any country, in any society, is necessarily composed of men who do the actual productive work of the country, whether in tilling the soil, in handicrafts, or in business. . . ."<sup>28</sup> The economic objective of the modern Egyptian should be, in other words, the development of a nation of productive workers who could by their own efforts add to the security and welfare of their country. In this regard he reiterated that his doctrine for Americans and for Africans was one and the same.<sup>29</sup>

Still other attributes of a great community modeled on Western lines Roosevelt urged on his Egyptian audiences. One of these was a Christian respect for womanhood. Stopping at the Luxor Mission on his way to Cairo he commented favorably on the training given the native girls at the Mission school. The women as well as the men must be elevated to a new status based on respect for the individual. This could be achieved in part by instructing the girls in the domestic arts to be sure, but neither should their literary education be neglected.<sup>30</sup> Another Western idea discussed briefly by Roosevelt was premised on what he considered sound American experience. This was a mutual respect for the religious beliefs of all Egyptians. Moslems, Copts, and Jews were mingled with native converts to Protestant and Catholic Christianity. Learn to live together regardless of religious differences was the practical advice he offered to overcome the dangers inherent in this situation.<sup>31</sup> Nor must the Egyptians allow their government to become dominated by the military. "Woe to the people whose army tries to play a part in politics," Colonel Roosevelt admonished the new Egypt.<sup>32</sup> Control by a military junta would preclude the erection of the very kind of society that he wished for his listeners; generals too frequently had been the death of freedom and criticism. Ali Youssef for one was in agreement.<sup>33</sup>

It was an easy matter for the Egyptians to accept Roosevelt's encouragement of their nationalistic ambitions. Americans were the exemplars of freedom and prosperity from whom they had

<sup>28</sup> "Law and Order in Egypt," *Speeches*, 23.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 23-24.

<sup>30</sup> *The Times* (London), March 24, 1910, 5; *The New York Times*, March 24, 1910, 4; "Mr. Roosevelt in Egypt," *loc. cit.*, 981.

<sup>31</sup> "Peace and Justice in the Sudan," *Speeches*, 6.

<sup>32</sup> *The Times* (London), March 18, 1910, 5.

<sup>33</sup> "Egypt's Reply to Colonel Roosevelt," *loc. cit.*, 730.

learned much, without paying tribute of suffering and humiliation.<sup>34</sup> A remarkable example of the nature of the feelings of the Middle East peoples for Americans is to be seen in a testimonial presented to the former president by a Committee representing the Syrian community of the city of Khartoum. The document is eloquent of the aspirations which motivated the inhabitants of their part of the world, whether in Syria, Turkey, the Sudan or Egypt. In part it read:

The chief reasons which the Syrians have to be grateful to America are the introduction of a system of free education or of education on terms within the means of the masses, and the broad and liberal lines of American policy in welcoming immigration. . . .

Schools were opened in almost all important centres of Syria, a printing press was established at Beirut, and a genuine yearning for the acquirement of knowledge animated the whole population . . . instilling into the minds of the rising generation the true principles of liberty, and inspiring them with American, English and French ideals of life.<sup>35</sup>

Roosevelt without doubt proudly accepted this accolade from a grateful people. After all these were the ideals of life he cherished as civilized man's highest expression. There were no better models to guide native peoples in reconstructing their societies for the future.

As for the present Roosevelt concerned himself with the fact and as he saw it with the necessity of British control in Egypt and Sudan. In turning to examine in detail this defense of the British occupation it is well to remember that the ex-president visited the area at a time when feelings of political unrest were rife with violence. To match the murder of Boutros Pasha there was Denshawai, of terrible memory.<sup>36</sup> At the time it might well have seemed that the final crisis in Anglo-Egyptian affairs was at hand.

<sup>34</sup> "Moreover, Egyptians have a greater liking for Americans than for Europeans because they consider that they have not been harmed by Americans, while at the same time they are getting the same benefits from the American civilization that they gain from Europe. . . . The Americans are, in fact, the only real teachers who taught the Egyptians honestly and did not interfere in politics." *Ibid.*, 729.

<sup>35</sup> "Address Presented to Colonel the Honorable Theodore Roosevelt by the Syrian Committee of Khartoum," March 17, 1910, Roosevelt *Mss.*

<sup>36</sup> In 1906 at Denshawai a British officer was killed by villagers during a misunderstanding over hunting privileges in the area. Three death sentences and several floggings were ordered by a Special Court and subsequently were carried out. Popular reaction among the Egyptians was violent in denouncing this judgment and penalty. Boutros Pasha had served as president of the Special Court.

The incumbent Agent General, Sir Eldon Gorst,<sup>37</sup> was not made of the stern stuff of Lord Cromer, and the Liberal ministry at London was divided as to its policy for Egypt between imperialists and little Englanders. Very probably these circumstances worked to intensify Roosevelt's antagonism to the nationalist political factions and make more pronounced the contradictions discernible in "Democratic Nationalism."

There were two major reasons in Roosevelt's thinking why Great Britain must not be disturbed in her occupation of the Nile provinces. Britain was a vessel of civilization, carrying Western ideas across the world. In each of his major speeches on the Egyptian question,<sup>38</sup> in extemporaneous remarks delivered to informal groups,<sup>39</sup> and in his private correspondence,<sup>40</sup> Roosevelt tirelessly insisted upon Britain's historic role as the agent of Western culture. Equally important was his conviction that the Egyptians were themselves incapable of self-government at the time, and the continuance of British power was its logical complement. According to Rooseveltian criteria it would be years, generations perhaps, before this deficiency would be overcome. Writing to Sir George O. Trevelyan he characterized nationalist agitation as centering in two groups: "... Levantine Moslems . . . of the ordinary Levantine type, noisy, emotional, rather decadent, *quite hopeless material on which to build*, but also not really dangerous as foes"; and second "the real strength of the nationalist movement . . . the mass of practically unchanged bigoted Moslems to whom the movement meant driving out the foreigner, plundering and slaying the local Christian, and a return to all the violence and corruption which festered under

<sup>37</sup> Sir Eldon Gorst (1861-1911), Consul General for Egypt, 1907-1910.

<sup>38</sup> *Speeches*, 3, 26-27, 159.

<sup>39</sup> "He gave two little addresses, one to the boys in the Government school, and the other to the principal merchants. Upon each he urged the necessity of doing everything in their power to perpetuate the present rule of peace and justice in the Sudan. To the merchants he said: 'Uphold the government which has given you prosperity and upon which your further prosperity depends.'" *The Times* (London), March 17, 1910, 5. In commenting upon the Gordon College as an example of a great civilization institution Roosevelt exclaimed: "Think of it! The sons of the Khalifa El Mahdi are studying in a college which perpetuates the name of the man originally responsible for the destruction of their father's power.'" *The New York Times*, March 16, 1910, 4. See also *The Times* (London), March 18, 1910, 5, for an account of Roosevelt's address at the Egyptian Officers' Club.

<sup>40</sup> Roosevelt to Sir Percy Girouard, July 21, 1910, *Roosevelt Mss.* Roosevelt to Lady Delamere, September 22, 1910, *ibid.* Roosevelt to Sir George Otto Trevelyan, October 1, 1911, *ibid.*



the old style Moslem rule, whether Asiatic or African."<sup>41</sup> Under such circumstances the Egyptians, however keen they might be for self-government at once, could not be trusted with it. Years of further political apprenticeship under British direction would have to intervene.<sup>42</sup> The fullest expression of Roosevelt's doubts about immediate Egyptian self-rule is contained in the speech before the National University, the same address with so much encouragement to the spirit of nationalism. In part, the audience was advised:

... the training of a nation to fit it successfully to fulfill the duties of self-government is a matter, not of a decade or two, but of generations. There are foolish empiricists who believe that the granting of a paper constitution, prefaced by some high sounding declaration, of itself confers the power of self-government upon a people. This is never so. Nobody can 'give' an individual 'self-help'. . . . With any people the essential quality is to show, not the haste of grasping after a power which it is only too easy to misuse, but a slow, steady, resolute development of those substantial qualities such as love of justice, love of fair-play, the spirit of self-reliance, of moderation, which alone enable a people to govern themselves.<sup>43</sup>

In the light of the foregoing analysis it is not unexpected that during the course of his journeying along the Nile Roosevelt frequently was heard to insist upon the wisdom of maintaining British power there, and that in his final address on the future of Egypt delivered in London he called for a strong arm to rule. In these passages of his speeches he assumed the attitude of a hard-fisted soldier intent on keeping order, rather than that of a patient colonial administrator concerned with demonstrating the reality of British justice. The "thing, not the form" was vital; it was England's "first duty to keep order."<sup>44</sup>

On the evening of his arrival in Khartoum Colonel Roosevelt was entertained at the palace of the Governor-General. His host

<sup>41</sup> Roosevelt to Sir George Otto Trevelyan, October 1, 1911, *ibid.* (Italics added)

<sup>42</sup> An extreme version of Roosevelt's estimate of the level of Egyptian political maturity is included in the following news story: "At Tintah Colonel Roosevelt was reminded that it was the spot where in 1882 the Moslems pulled the Christians out of the trains and massacred them. 'Yes,' said Colonel Roosevelt, 'and that is just what should happen again if they had self-rule in Egypt.'" *New York Evening Journal*, March 31, 1910, 21. Although one may hesitate to give credence to this report in that its chief source is the somewhat sensational *Evening Journal* the ex-president would in effect say the same thing in his London address; it is also necessary to point out that whether authentic or not, the story circulated among the Egyptians. See "Egypt's Reply to Colonel Roosevelt," *loc. cit.*, 736.

<sup>43</sup> "Law and Order in Egypt," *Speeches*, 24-25.

<sup>44</sup> "British Rule in Africa," *ibid.*, 171.

was Slatin Pasha,<sup>45</sup> the Sirdar, the senior British military officer in the Sudan, and his fellow diners were British military and civil officials. Roosevelt was not to speak formally, but in the course of the dinner conversation the subject of the assassination of Boutros Pasha was brought up. He was asked what he would have done had he been the Agent General. The reply forthcoming is a forceful example of Roosevelt's "tough" policy as a reaction against extreme nationalist pressure to achieve self-government.

It is very simple. I would try the murderer at drumhead court-martial. As there is no question about the facts, for his own faction do not deny the assassination, he would be taken out and shot; and then if the home government cabled me, in one of their moments of vacillation to wait a little while, I would cable in reply: 'Can't wait the assassin has been tried and shot.' The home government might recall me or impeach me if they wanted to, but *that* assassin would have received his just deserts.<sup>46</sup>

This conversational remark largely sets the tone for all of Roosevelt's more formal addresses when his theme gravitated to the rights of the Egyptians for immediate self-rule. Many of the British audience were pleased to have this "tough" answer and he was urged to speak out for law and order whenever possible.<sup>47</sup> Two days later in a formal address before British officialdom at the Sudan Club Roosevelt paid tribute to the work of the British and insisted that any attempt to dislodge them from their Nile occupation would be criminal.<sup>48</sup> As he was to remark later in London, self-government in the hands of the Sudanese had been the self-government of the wolf-pack,<sup>49</sup> a situation no civilized power could permit to continue unchecked. Native press reaction to these opinions concerning the political future of Egypt and her people was high-lighted by repeated demands for local autonomy and even a warning to Roosevelt that he should not dare to speak out again in a pro-British vein.<sup>50</sup> Nothing daunted, next day upon invita-

<sup>45</sup> Rudolph Carl, Baron Slatin, (1857-1932), Austrian-born Inspector-General of the Sudan, 1900-1915.

<sup>46</sup> Lawrence F. Abbott, *Impressions of Theodore Roosevelt*, New York, 1919, 154-155. Italics in original.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 155.

<sup>48</sup> *The Times* (London), March 18, 1910, 5.

<sup>49</sup> "British Rule In Africa," *Speeches*, 165.

<sup>50</sup> For a personal reflection concerning the political stir that "Peace and Justice in the Sudan" created and threats made against Roosevelt see R. S. McClernahan to J. C. O'Laughlin, March 27, 1910, Roosevelt *Mss.* McClernahan was with the American Presbyterian Mission, Assuit, Egypt; O'Laughlin was a *Chicago Tribune* correspondent assigned to the Roosevelt tour of Africa and Europe.

tion he addressed the Egyptian Officers club where nationalist feeling was understandably strong. Slatin Pasha had asked in advance that the native officers be urged to maintain "their absolute and unflinching loyalty to English rule" and Roosevelt "very gladly" consented to do so.<sup>51</sup> In the speech that followed the officers were warned of the dangers of involvement in politics.

The soldier who mixes politics with soldiering becomes a bad politician and a poor soldier. In the Spanish War, most of the men in my regiment differed from me in politics. I didn't care a particle. I knew they felt so long as they were in uniform, that their duty and pride bade them to be soldiers and nothing else, and that they devote all their thoughts, will and energy to working for the greatness of the flag under which they fought.<sup>52</sup>

This loyalty to British rule at the expense of national aspirations, with the curious analogy of the Spanish war only adding a note of obscurity, must have seemed ill-founded to many of the native officers. It tends to emphasize once more that Roosevelt frequently did not relate theory to the facts at hand. That he was inclined to persist in his illogical attitudes is illustrated by events shortly after his Officers' Club talk, when two days later at Assuan he repeated his warnings about the dangers of mixing politics and soldiering to a group of native officers informally gathered to greet him.<sup>53</sup>

The unsettling effect that Roosevelt's widely circulating opinions were having upon the Egyptians may be judged from Sir Eldon Gorst's initial desire that he say nothing of the assassination of Boutros Pasha in his scheduled speech to the National University. This Roosevelt refused to do and his outspoken opposition apparently convinced Gorst that some good could come of an admonition to the Egyptians to forego violence in their feud with Great Britain.<sup>54</sup> Thus, while the greater portion of this address was devoted to praise and encouragement of the University with the nationalistic appeal already discussed, it also included a stinging rebuke to the assassins:

<sup>51</sup> Roosevelt to Sir George Otto Trevelyan, October 1, 1911, *Roosevelt Mss.*

<sup>52</sup> *The Times* (London), March 18, 1910, 5.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, March 21, 1910, 5.

<sup>54</sup> Roosevelt to Sir George Otto Trevelyan, October 1, 1911, *Roosevelt Mss.*, Gorst wrote: "how glad I am that you consented to speak to these people. If anything can bring them into a more reasonable frame of mind your words should have that effect." Gorst to Roosevelt, March 26, 1910, *ibid.*

All good men, all men of every nation whose respect is worth having, have been inexpressibly shocked. . . .

The type of man which turns out the assassin is a type possessing all the qualities most alien to good citizenship. . . . Such a man stands on a pinnacle of evil infamy.<sup>55</sup>

Perhaps this publicly administered reprimand was the most striking phase of the address, given the circumstances of tension and bad feeling. British approval certainly was not lacking, Roosevelt's words having been edited and approved in advance by both Gorst and Wingate.<sup>56</sup> But *Almo*, one of the organs of the Constitutional Nationalists, seemed to think that Roosevelt had also come out for more self-government for the Egyptians.

Some criticism is due to the bad translation [it told its readers] made in reference to the strategic position of Europe, which seemed to indicate that he [Roosevelt] desired England always to remain in Egypt. [But] he has insisted that the Egyptians are as fit for a Constitution as the people of Turkey, which movement Mr. Roosevelt has approved.<sup>57</sup>

It depended upon which part of the speech was studied, and by whom. The Cairo address is of critical significance in this examination of the nature of Roosevelt's "Democratic Nationalism" in that the logical cleavage in his thinking is so unmistakable within the passages of a single speech. This factor helps to rule out the interpretation that he may have arrived at Khartoum with a false impression of the civilizational level of the Nile peoples, only to be convinced shortly of the position that continued British occupation was both blessing and necessity. Nor is there evidence from other sources that Roosevelt's estimate of the Egyptian potentiality for self-rule was altered by his personal experiences with the peoples there. Both these considerations re-emphasize a confusion of theory and reality that is part of this Egyptian particularization of the *Weltanschauung* of "Democratic Nationalism."

Perhaps the most widely known of Theodore Roosevelt's speeches on the Egyptian question is "British Rule in Africa," de-

<sup>55</sup> "Law and Order in Egypt," *Speeches*, 26.

<sup>56</sup> Sir Reginald Wingate to Roosevelt, March 30, 1910, Roosevelt Mss. Sir Reginald Wingate to Roosevelt, June 8, 1910, *ibid.* (Wingate was British Governor-General in the Sudan.) *The Times* correspondent reported that Roosevelt's speech was "heartily welcomed here [Cairo] by the British, French and those natives who have large interests which would be affected by a change in the system of government. It is hoped that it may help to convince the United States and the continent that British occupation is the only guarantee of order and financial stability." *The Times* (London), March 31, 1910, 9.

<sup>57</sup> *The New York Times*, March 30, 1910, 3.

livered at the Guildhall in London on May 31, 1910, on the occasion of granting the freedom of the City of London to the former president. There is little in it susceptible of favorable interpretation by the nationalists. It has been termed the "govern or go" address which is an apt summation of its most forceful passage:

Now either you have the right to be in Egypt or you have not; either it is or it is not your duty to establish and keep order. If you feel that you have not the right to be in Egypt, if you do not wish to establish and keep order there, why then, by all means get out of Egypt. If, as I hope, you feel that your duty to civilized mankind and your fealty to your own great tradition alike bid you stay, then make the fact and the name agree and show that you are ready to meet in very deed the responsibility which is yours.<sup>58</sup>

The dangers of self-government for a people such as the Egyptians had been demonstrated amply in the Sudan, Roosevelt pointed out. Under Sudanese rule "great crimes were committed . . . crimes so dark that their very hideousness protects them from exposure. . . . Then the English came in; put an end to independence and self-government which wrought this hideous evil, restored order, kept the peace and gave to each individual . . . liberty. . . ."<sup>59</sup> And so must it be in Egypt. For Roosevelt the murder of Boutros Pasha was conclusive of this. " . . . The attitude of the so-called Egyptian Nationalist Party in connection with this foul murder has shown that they neither were desirous nor capable of guaranteeing even that primary justice, the failure to supply which makes self-government not merely empty but a noxious farce."<sup>60</sup>

As has been pointed out, "British Rule in Africa" was consistent in its appeal for an indefinite continuation of the British occupation. May it be argued in consequence that this speech represented the matured convictions of Theodore Roosevelt on the question of Egypt, and as such marks the high plateau of a consistent policy pronouncement by him after confusion among the foothills of conflict and unrest in Egypt itself? Two conditions tend to discourage this conclusion. One is the rather brief period of time elapsing between the date of the Cairo address (March 28) and that of the London talk (May 31). This interim, it should be kept in mind, was taken up with an almost constant round of public appearances, formal receptions and social functions from the draw-

<sup>58</sup> "British Rule In Africa," *Speeches*, 171.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, 165.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 170.



ing rooms of Vienna to the common rooms of Oxford. Roosevelt probably had little opportunity for the kind of serious reflection by means of which political attitudes of the most significant sort are refined and crystallized. A second consideration is the all British audience that was his in London; successful politicians are by instinct sensitive to the moods and prejudices of their listeners.

The Guildhall address had firmly placed Roosevelt in the camp of the imperialists in the popular mind—the popular Anglo-American mind. But there was that "new Egypt" of which he had spoken and his native audiences quite understandably might have been most influenced by those phases of his talks that emphasized the national potential of their country. The total meaning of Roosevelt's words was such as to indicate that his own attitude was confused and inconsistent. He had brought to his task of pronouncing a British policy for Egypt a profound faith in the great worth of self-government and a perplexing belief that nationalism by definition was a monopoly of the West. It is clear from his speeches that he was no friend of Egyptian self-rule; yet he had preached eloquently to the people of their country and what each might do to strengthen it. A productive economy, a self-reliant population, a spirit of free and critical inquiry—all these things he had wished for Egypt. Modern nations have been built on no less. Even as he was excoriating the Levantine Moslems—"noisy, emotional, rather decadent"—he was in search of a people on which to build. With disarming clarity had Roosevelt himself, as though by accident, revealed the nature of the dilemma of Western imperialism, and the conflict in his own "Democratic Nationalism" that was a microcosm of it.

DAVID H. BURTON

St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia

## The Midwestern Immigrant and Politics: A Case Study

Historians have long neglected to study the role of the Midwestern immigrant groups in politics. General statements concerning the political allegiances and voting behavior of the various foreign-born groups have been made by both careful scholars and casual observers. Yet, there have been few, if any, "grass roots" investigations to support these conclusions. This study attempts to answer three questions: (1) Did the politicians view the immigrant group as a force in politics? (2) Was there a pattern to immigrant voting? (3) To what extent did ethnic group identity influence the immigrant vote?

North Dakota serves well as an area for this study because of the high percentage of foreign-born in its population and because the immigrant population was divided into three distinct geographical sections. The election of 1900 was chosen because at that time the foreign-born population was at its greatest strength. Also, in 1900 the issue of imperialism was raised—in part to sway certain ethnic group votes.

### *Historical Background*

In 1890 North Dakota's population had been 182,000, while ten years later there were 319,000 people in the state.<sup>1</sup> North Dakota showed the greatest percentage increase of the Great Plains states for the ten year period, a notable increase caused by the great influx of immigrant groups.<sup>2</sup> Of the total population in 1900, 133,091 were of foreign origins with the Norwegians, Germans, and Canadians making up the three largest groups.

The Norwegians, numbering 30,206 in 1900, comprised 9.5 per cent of the state's population.<sup>3</sup> This national group found its principal area of settlement in the eastern counties of the state. Norwegians started migrating to the United States as early as 1825, but the main flow began after the Civil War when more than

<sup>1</sup> *Census Reports, I, Twelfth Census of the United States, "Population,"* Part I, Washington, 1901, 33. Hereafter cited as *Twelfth Census*.

<sup>2</sup> C. F. Kraenzel, *The Great Plains in Transition*, Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1953, 138.

<sup>3</sup> *Twelfth Census*, 732-734.

100,000 came between 1866-1873. A second great movement of Norwegians to America took place between 1879 and 1889 when over a quarter of a million arrived.<sup>4</sup> Although there were many reasons for this exodus from the Old Country, Einar Haugen best sums them up as "the hope for *social betterment*."<sup>5</sup>

It was not long until the Norwegians within the United States began to move westward as the tide of immigration increased. By the 1870's they had pushed across Minnesota into the Red River Valley. A decade later these people were dominant in the eastern part of North Dakota.<sup>6</sup>

The Germans made up another ethnic group of importance in North Dakota at this time. There were two distinct national groups of Germanic origin—the "Reich" Germans and the "Ruzlaends" or German-Russians. At the close of the nineteenth century, there were 14,179 German-Russians and 11,546 Germans in the state; together they comprised over eight per cent of the population.<sup>7</sup> The "Reich" Germans were those Germans who migrated to the United States from Germany. The primary cause of their migration was "undoubtedly economic"; however, the disturbed political conditions in western Europe provided another motive.<sup>8</sup> The first Germans to move into the Midwest settled in Wisconsin and southern Minnesota. As more and more Germans came into the area, their ethnic frontier was extended into parts of North Dakota. The "Reich" Germans were scattered over the whole state, but their greatest concentration was in Morton, Oliver, and Mercer counties located in the Missouri Valley area.<sup>9</sup>

The German-Russians were not Russian in origin, but Germanic. These people left Germany for the area around the Black Sea during the years of unrest in Europe between the Seven Years War and the fall of Napoleon. Catherine II and Alexander II

<sup>4</sup> Ingrid Semmingsen, "Norwegian Emigration to America During the Nineteenth Century," *Norwegian-American Studies and Records*, XI (1940), 68-70.

<sup>5</sup> Einar Haugen, "Norwegian Migration to America," *Norwegian-American Studies and Records*, XVIII (1954), 2; For general discussions about motives for immigration see: Carlton Qualey, "Pioneer Norwegian Settlement in North Dakota," *North Dakota History*, V (October, 1930), 21-22; Carl Wittke, *We Who Built America, The Saga of the Immigrant*, New York, 1939, 264-265.

<sup>6</sup> Carlton Qualey, "Pioneer Norwegian Settlement in North Dakota," *North Dakota History*, V (October, 1930), 16.

<sup>7</sup> *Twelfth Census*, 734-736.

<sup>8</sup> Wittke, *We Who Built America*, 188.

<sup>9</sup> Jesse A. Tanner, "Foreign Migration into North Dakota," *Collections of the State Historical Society of North Dakota*, I, (1906), 131-135.

of Russia offered them religious freedom, tariff-free trade, self-government, military exemption, loans and other rights if they would make Russia their home. The immediate cause of their movement to the United States was the cancellation of many of these rights including military exemption. It was not long until thousands of eligible men and their families left the Black Sea region for America where they found new homes in the agricultural Midwest.<sup>10</sup> In North Dakota the German-Russians settled in the central and southern areas of the state.

Before the Europeans began finding homes in North Dakota, French and English Canadians had crossed the international boundary to settle in northern North Dakota. The Canadian-born population reached its peak in 1900 with 25,004 people, or nine per cent of the state population. This ethnic group dominated those counties bordering Canada—Bottineau, Rollette, Towner, Cavalier, Pembina, and Walsh.<sup>11</sup>

### *The Immigrant and the Campaign*

The immigrant was the center of attention in the North Dakota campaign of 1900. Since the ethnic groups were a potential political power, both parties attempted to win their votes. Two editorials, one in the Republican *Lakota Herald* and the other in the Democratic *Devils Lake Free Press*, keynoted the state campaign when they implied that the aim of both political parties was to capture the votes of the immigrant population. The *Lakota Herald* believed "it was plainly evident . . . that the so-called German vote will occupy a good share of the attention of Bryan Democrats,"<sup>12</sup> while the *Devils Lake Free Press* contended that "the Republicans will endeavor to hold the normally Republican Norwegians and at the same time work on the Germans."<sup>13</sup>

The Democrats, as the *Lakota Herald* suggested, placed their main emphasis upon convincing the Germans that their party was "the party which stood for the high ideals of liberty and peace that the Germans did."<sup>14</sup> In attempting to bring the German voters into the Democratic column the Democrats advanced the argument that the Republican party was the party of "imperialism."

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 199; Wittke, *We Who Built America*, 311.

<sup>11</sup> Leon H. Truesdell, *The Canadian Born in the United States*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 29; *Twelfth Census*, 732-734.

<sup>12</sup> *Lakota Herald*, July 6, 1900.

<sup>13</sup> *Devils Lake Free Press*, July 13, 1900.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

The *Bathgate Pink Paper*, one of the two Democratic daily newspapers in the state, illustrated this when it declared: "The Republican party's stand on imperialism and ultimate militarism is against all in which the German of today believes."<sup>15</sup> The Democrats also argued that the Republicans' friendship toward England had "entangled us in an unwritten alliance with Great Britain, Germany's rising rival"; they further reasoned that "no loyal citizen of the United States of German birth can longer support the Republicans."<sup>16</sup> Bryan's party felt that the German had come to this country to escape "what the Republicans now push down his throat—militarism concealed in imperialism."<sup>17</sup>

The Democrats also tried to secure German votes by nominating a German, Max Wipperman, for the governorship. The importance of selecting a candidate for governor who would appeal to the ethnic population was illustrated by National Democratic Committeeman I. P. Baker who wrote: "While at our state convention we could not find a good strong Scandinavian, we did find a good strong German to run . . . , and as the German vote is quite numerous . . . I think we can elect him."<sup>18</sup>

Wipperman's role in the campaign was to "make flying trips to speak at German gatherings," to "organize Germans into Democratic clubs," and to "overcome Republican charges" in order to "bring the German and German-Russian population under Democratic control."<sup>19</sup> The Democrats believed that they could win the governorship by using a German candidate to lure the German vote.

The Republicans did not concentrate as much effort on winning the German vote as did the Democrats. Yet to counteract the influence of Wipperman in German areas, they established a German-language newspaper, *Die Wacht am Missouri*, which carried Republican views throughout the German counties.<sup>20</sup> Recognizing the advantage of having this important ethnic group represented on the

<sup>15</sup> *Bathgate Pink Paper*, as quoted in *Church's Ferry Sun*, July 20, 1900.

<sup>16</sup> *Yankton Press and Dakotan*, July 18, 1900. This paper, printed in South Dakota, was widely circulated throughout the German areas in southern North Dakota.

<sup>17</sup> *Wahpeton Times*, July 13, 1900.

<sup>18</sup> I. P. Baker to Richard Pettigrew, July 28, 1900. I. P. Baker Papers, North Dakota Historical Society Library, Bismarck, North Dakota. Hereafter cited as Baker Papers.

<sup>19</sup> I. P. Baker to Max Wipperman, November 2, 1900; I. P. Baker to Thomas Kleinogl, August 15, 1900; I. P. Baker to William F. Foye, October 22, 1900; Baker Papers.

<sup>20</sup> *Dickinson Press*, July 15, 1900.



party ticket, they nominated a German, Ferdinand Leutz, for the position of Commissioner of Insurance.<sup>21</sup> It was also alleged that the Republicans had "taken ten to twelve kegs and a number of cases of beer into a German community to make a drastic effort to capture the German vote there."<sup>22</sup>

On the other hand, although the state Republicans were "of the opinion that the Norse and other Scandinavians were always and would always be Republicans,"<sup>23</sup> they attempted to secure the votes of this important ethnic group for their party. This plan to center the campaign upon the Norwegians and other Scandinavians rested upon Senator Knute Nelson of Minnesota, who was described as the "most popular man in the United States with the Scandinavian population."<sup>24</sup> Nelson was especially popular in the Red River Valley for he had supported legislation which was or would have been beneficial to that region. The Republicans, therefore, wished to have Nelson come into North Dakota to plead the Republican cause with his fellow Scandinavians.<sup>25</sup>

While Nelson was visiting the Red River Valley area, a delegation of North Dakota Republicans asked him to come into North Dakota to address a rally to be held in Grand Forks. In a spectacular incident Nelson vowed he would never speak for the Republicans of his sister state while it was dominated by political bossism.<sup>26</sup> Republican hopes to use Nelson were crushed. Knowing that this incident could cost them Scandinavian votes, the Republicans tried to keep the matter out of the press.<sup>27</sup>

On the other hand, the Democrats took full advantage of the Republican blunder. The *Bathgate Pink Paper* warned the Scandinavian voters that they should follow Nelson's advice and not support the Republican machine.<sup>28</sup> In order to capitalize upon this

<sup>21</sup> *Mandan Pioneer*, July 13, 1900.

<sup>22</sup> I. P. Baker to Max Wipperman, November 2, 1900. Baker Papers.

<sup>23</sup> *Devils Lake Free Press*, August 18, 1900.

<sup>24</sup> W. Jewell to Solomon Comstock, October 1, 1900. Solomon Comstock Papers, Minnesota State Historical Society Library, St. Paul, Minnesota.

<sup>25</sup> R. W. Farrar to Knute Nelson, October 10, 1900; G. S. Norgaard to Knute Nelson, September 22, 1900; Porter J. McCumber to Knute Nelson, August 28, 1900. Knute Nelson Papers, Minnesota State Historical Society Library, St. Paul, Minnesota. Hereafter cited as Nelson Papers.

<sup>26</sup> "Why Not Speak in North Dakota?"—clipping dated October 22, 1900. Nelson Papers.

<sup>27</sup> Of the Republican newspapers surveyed for this study not one reported the Nelson incident.

<sup>28</sup> *Bathgate Pink Paper* as quoted in the *Grand Forks Plaindealer*, October 26, 1900. Other Democratic papers that emphasized the Nelson incident were: *Grafton News and Times*, October 19, 1900; *Grand Forks Plaindealer*, October 25, 1900.

situation, the Democratic campaign headquarters had "several thousand of Nelson's anti-Republican remarks printed in Norwegian and Swedish and circulated in Scandinavian areas of the state."<sup>29</sup>

From this evidence it is clearly seen that the political parties believed that the ethnic group could become a powerful weapon in the winning of an election. It was felt that control of one or more of the major immigrant groups was essential to victory at the polls. The only major ethnic group not strongly concentrated upon was the Canadian. It may have been that the Republicans believed that these people were a lost cause because they had previously supported Democratic candidates with few exceptions.

### *Voting Behavior of the Immigrant*

The election of 1900 retained Republican William McKinley in the White House. In polling the largest plurality in Republican history, he received 7,218,491 votes or 51.7 per cent—a slight increase over 1896. The defeated William Jennings Bryan got 6,358,071 or 45.5 per cent of the vote.<sup>30</sup> In North Dakota there was a greater Republican landslide than in the United States as a whole; McKinley's 35,898 votes represented 62 per cent of the votes cast, while Bryan polled 20,531 or 35.5 per cent of the state's ballots—10 per cent less than on the national level. Also, McKinley's 1900 total in North Dakota was 7 per cent greater than it had been in 1896, while Bryan's was 7.2 per cent below his previous showing.<sup>31</sup>

The Republicans swept every state office with the candidate for governor, Frank White, capturing 59 per cent of the votes as compared to Democrat Wipperman's 38 per cent. White carried all but three counties in recording the greatest Republican state victory since statehood.<sup>32</sup> The immigrant groups, as well as the native population, seemed to support the Republicans in 1900.

Of the three major ethnic groups the Canadians comprised one-fourth of the total foreign-born population. This group was dominant in the counties adjacent to Canada—30 per cent in Pembina, 29 per cent in Cavalier, 21 per cent in Bottineau, 19 per cent

<sup>29</sup> I. P. Baker to Thomas Kleinogl, October 22, 1900. Baker Papers.

<sup>30</sup> Edgar E. Robinson, *The Presidential Vote, 1896-1932*, Stanford University, Stanford University Press, 1934, 7-9.

<sup>31</sup> *Legislative Manual, 1897*, (Bismarck: Tribune Printers, 1897), 104; *Legislative Manual 1901*, (Bismarck: Tribune Printers, 1901), 126.

<sup>32</sup> *Legislative Manual, 1901*, 128.

in Rollette, 15 per cent in Walsh, and 9 per cent in Towner.<sup>33</sup> In 1896 this section of the state gave the Democrats and Bryan a sizable margin of victory, but in 1900 these Canadian counties repudiated the Democratic party and gave McKinley the majority of the votes with a great percentage increase over the previous election.<sup>34</sup> It certainly appeared that the Canadians cast their ballots as a mass protest against the Democrats.

This abrupt reversal of political allegiance was probably caused by two factors. First, in their attempt to win German votes, the Democrats had pursued an anti-English attitude. They attacked the Republicans because they had formed an "unwritten alliance with Great Britain."<sup>35</sup> This action lost the Democrats many of the Canadian immigrant voters who maintained close ties with Canada and the English tradition. Secondly, many Canadians would not support a party that sympathized with the Boers in South Africa. While Bryan was campaigning in the Canadian countries of North Dakota, he seriously blundered when he attacked England's imperialistic policy in South Africa.<sup>36</sup> This incident undoubtedly drove Canadian voters into the Republican ranks.

It was the German immigrant population that during the campaign received the most attention from the political parties. While both parties sought to woo this ethnic group into their columns, it was the Democratic party which most vigorously tried to win German immigrant support by raising the issue of imperialism and by nominating a German for the governorship. The election results proved that the Democratic belief that a German running for the position of governor would carry the German counties was mistaken. Although Wipperman ran 3 per cent ahead of Bryan, he was able to win only three counties—Richland, Oliver, and Walsh. No doubt he was able to win Richland because it was his home county. Although he did carry the German county of Oliver, there were thirteen other heavily German counties that he did not carry. In McIntosh county (46 per cent German) White defeated Wipperman 602-181, while Wipperman was beaten in Mercer county (37 per cent German) by a vote of 221-83.<sup>37</sup>

Although it was believed that Wipperman would be able to aid the national Democratic ticket in German regions, Bryan was unable

<sup>33</sup> *Twelfth Census*, 732-734.

<sup>34</sup> *Legislative Manual*, 1901, 126-128.

<sup>35</sup> *Yankton Press and Dakotan*, July 18, 1900.

<sup>36</sup> *Grafton News and Times*, October 3, 1900.

<sup>37</sup> *Legislative Manual*, 1901, 128.

to win a single county. He did, however, improve his 1896 average in the German counties of Emmons (34 per cent German), Stark (21 per cent German), and Pierce (14 per cent German). The only areas where Bryan gained strength over his 1896 performance were German counties. He lost no more than 5 per cent of 1896 percentage in the counties of Morton (37 per cent German), Mercer (37 per cent German), Stutsman (13 per cent German), and McIntosh (46 per cent German).<sup>38</sup> Perhaps Bryan was able to maintain his strength because Wipperman was the gubernatorial candidate. Also, undoubtedly some Germans feared the "unwritten alliance with Great Britain" and Republican imperialism. The important factor is that the Democrats were able to maintain their power in many German areas while all other ethnic groups turned to the Republicans.

The largest ethnic group was the Norwegian. Since first coming to the United States they had been a strong element of the Republican party.<sup>39</sup> In the election of 1900 in North Dakota this immigrant group remained solidly in the Republican party. Such strongly Norwegian counties as Traill (26 per cent Norwegian), Griggs (22 per cent Norwegian), Nelson (19 per cent Norwegian), and Grand Forks (14 per cent Norwegian) gave McKinley a greater percentage of their votes in 1900 than in 1896.<sup>40</sup> This trend was also illustrated on the precinct level. In Norway precinct of Traill county McKinley defeated Bryan 43-16, while Norway precinct of Nelson county supported McKinley, 67-10.<sup>41</sup> The Knute Nelson incident caused few Norwegians to bolt their traditional party.

Although one writer has contended that these Norwegian immigrants "brought with them from Norway a tradition of rural socialism, a political heritage which they found little reason to discard in their new homeland,"<sup>42</sup> there is little evidence to support such a conclusion. Traill county (26 per cent Norwegian), the most heavily dominated by the Norwegian ethnic group, cast only .8 per cent of its ballots for Debs on the Socialist ticket, while Griggs and Steele counties (each 22 per cent Norwegian) gave

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 126.

<sup>39</sup> George Stephenson, "The Mind of the Scandinavian Immigrant," *Norwegian-American Studies and Records*, IV (1929), 72-73.

<sup>40</sup> *Legislative Manual*, 1901, 126.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 161, 170.

<sup>42</sup> Jackson K. Putnam, "The Role of the NDSP in North Dakota History," *North Dakota Quarterly*, XXIV (Fall, 1956), 116. Note: NDSP means North Dakota Socialist Party.

the Socialist only .2 per cent of their vote.<sup>43</sup> McHenry and Ward counties in the north-central part of the state were the centers of Socialist strength. In neither were the Norwegians the dominant group. The Norwegians in 1900 remained faithful to the Republican party.

### Conclusion

From this study of immigrant groups and their part in an election, two main points may be drawn. First, politicians of the day believed that there was political strength in the ethnic group. Secondly, there was an evident pattern to immigrant voting. This second conclusion might suggest that ethnic group identity was a factor that influenced the immigrant vote.

The contention that politicians thought the ethnic group to be politically important needs no further elaboration. The efforts of the major political parties to capture the immigrant vote serves as sufficient evidence; the immigrant vote was the main concern of the campaigners. The observation that there was a voting pattern to the foreign-born vote that followed ethnic lines has been amply documented. However, the conclusion that group identity might have been a factor determining the vote needs clarification.

Although some writers have suggested that ethnic group identity was the sole factor influencing the vote in areas of large foreign population, this can be seriously challenged. Certainly economic conditions played a key role in molding the voting mind. The year 1900 was prosperous in North Dakota. Wheat prices reached fifty-eight cents a bushel as contrasted to thirty-eight in 1896 when McKinley was first elected. Corn, oats, barley, as well as wool prices made similar advances. Rising land prices coupled with a decline in mortgage indebtedness made it evident that better times had arrived under the Republicans.<sup>44</sup> Prosperity swayed many votes into the Republican column.

The role of group identity, however, can not be completely disregarded; it was *a* factor, although not *the* factor. The complete reversal of Canadian political allegiance illustrates the immigrant in mass protest as a group—be it against Democratic anti-English attitudes or Democratic depression. The fact that Bryan was able to maintain his strength in traditionally German areas indicates that

<sup>43</sup> *Legislative Manual*, 1901, 126.

<sup>44</sup> *Fargo Record*, VII (January, February, March, 1901), 4; *Larimore Pioneer*, June 15, 1900; *LaMoure Chronicle*, December 29, 1900.



group identity could have been an influencing force. No doubt there were those Norwegians who cast a Republican ballot because their fathers had done so before, or because the candidate was a Johnson or an Olson.

Thus, it appears that group identity did play a role in the voting of the immigrant. But it was only one force among many that influenced not only the immigrant vote, but also that of the native American.

D. JEROME TWETON

University of Oklahoma, Norman

## The Waning Prestige of Lewis Cass

Milo Quaife said that "the memory of Cass has been allowed to sink into obscurity and neglect. Considering the role he played, few Americans have received less attention at the hands of writers of history."<sup>1</sup> Many historians would agree that Cass has been largely forgotten—even in Michigan. The following appeared in the *Detroit Collegian*:

While he achieved a creditable record as governor, as a national figure, Lewis Cass was the conventional politician and achieved little which entitles him to renown.

Perhaps the most authentic and reliable estimate of Lewis Cass is that of the late Professor Channing of Harvard who wrote that he "had a great reputation in his day, although the reason for it is somewhat indistinct at the present time."<sup>2</sup>

What influence did Cass wield during his long political career? When was his power greatest? When did it decline?

Cass, of course, enjoyed a great deal of prestige because of the important political offices which he held.<sup>3</sup> He was highly respected within the Party. Andrew Jackson wrote to Cass in 1843: "Having full confidence in your abilities and republican principles I invited you to my cabinet, and I never can forget with what discretion and talents you met those great and delicate questions which were brought before you whilst you Presided [*sic*] over the Department of War. . . ."<sup>4</sup>

Polk, too, had respect for Cass, who had been gracious in the loss of the Democratic nomination to him in 1844. Cass had even campaigned enthusiastically for Polk in Michigan. Hewlett stated that "on May 6 [1846], on the basis of dispatches from General Taylor, Polk called a meeting of his top advisers: Vice-President

<sup>1</sup> Milo M. Quaife, "Some Reflections Concerning the Papers of Lewis Cass," 1; Manuscript in the Lewis Cass Papers. Burton Historical collection, Detroit Public Library.

<sup>2</sup> E. R. Skinner and Bryan Rust, "Question the Greatness of Lewis Cass," *Detroit Collegian*, January 17, 1934.

<sup>3</sup> He was governor of Michigan Territory, 1813-1831; Secretary of War, 1831-1836; Minister to France, 1836-1842; Democratic presidential candidate, 1848; United States Senator, 1845-1857; Secretary of State, 1857-1861.

<sup>4</sup> Letter from Andrew Jackson to Lewis Cass, July 8, 1843, as quoted in *General Lewis Cass, 1782-1866*, Norwood, Mass.: Plimpton Press, 1916, 24.

Dallas, Secretary of War Marcy, Secretary of State Buchanan, and Senator Cass."<sup>5</sup> Two years later Polk wrote to the Michigan Senator: "I need not assure you, that I shall be most happy if at the close of my term I can surrender the Government into your hands."<sup>6</sup> When Cass failed to win the presidency in 1848, Polk informed him:

I am glad to learn from you, that it is possible that you may accept a re-election to the Senate and be in Washington this winter. My opinion is that under the circumstances of your position you ought not to hesitate to accept an election to the Senate. The whole Democratic party, I am sure, would be highly gratified to see you again a member of that body, where you would have the opportunity as you have heretofore so ably done, to reindicate and maintain the course of the Democratic policy.<sup>7</sup>

The *Detroit Advertiser*, vehemently anti-Democratic, stated: "It cannot be denied that in point of talent, influence, and distinguished reputation Gen. Cass is immensely above all other Loco Focos who are talked about for that office [Senate seat from Michigan]."<sup>8</sup> The *National Whig*, a pro-Taylor paper in Washington, said that although "opposed to many of Governor Cass' political doctrines, we have regarded him as one of the ablest statesmen of the country, and we are rejoiced that he will have a seat on the floor of the Senate during President Taylor's term. . . ."<sup>9</sup>

Perhaps the prestige of the Michigan Senator was never higher than when he returned to the Senate in 1849:

In 1849 Cass came to Washington not only well-known but as a man of great prestige and dignity. It was no longer necessary for him to carry his opinions to others; younger men would now come to him for the benefit of his judgment and experience. His political career had reached its climax just one year before in the Presidential race. Now with ambition mellowed and spirit tempered by many political conflicts, Cass virtually 'retired' to the Senate. He had made his mark; he was willing to leave

<sup>5</sup> Richard G. Hewlett, "Lewis Cass in National Politics, 1842-1861." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History, University of Chicago, 1952, 84. "I desire to see you for a few minutes this morning if it shall be convenient for you to call." Letter from James K. Polk to Cass, March 30, 1846. Lewis Cass Papers, William L. Clements Library, University of Michigan.

<sup>6</sup> Letter from James K. Polk to Cass, August 24, 1848. Lewis Cass Papers. "To see General Cass in the White House is and has been for years the chief political desire of my heart." Letter from James K. Polk to Lucius Lyon, November 4, 1848. *Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> Letter from James K. Polk to Cass, November 26, 1848. *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> *Detroit Advertiser* as quoted by the *Hillsdale Gazette*, February 1, 1849.

<sup>9</sup> *Washington National Whig* as quoted by the *Hillsdale Gazette*, February 1, 1849.

the petty strivings for position to younger men. He refused appointment to any of the standing committees of the Senate. Leaving the preparation and presentation of bills to others, Cass was content with a pointed question on routine problems; with a few words to clear the air and soothe the nerves in times of crisis; with a voluminous, learned, set speech on great issues before the Senate. By remaining aloof from work-a-day functions of the Senate, Cass was able to achieve something of the role of the elder statesman, one who could be called on when the problems of state became too big for ordinary men. If he was not of this calibre, at least he was able to convey that impression to many people in 1850.<sup>10</sup>

For several years previous to and subsequent to the apogee of his political career in 1848, Cass enjoyed great respect and prestige. The *Ann Arbor Signal of Liberty* stated that "as an individual we have respect for the General."<sup>11</sup> *The Baltimore Sun*, alluding to Cass, remarked in 1852: "There is an innate dignity in some men, which cannot be eclipsed even by what would appear as grotesque in other persons."<sup>12</sup> *The Hillsdale Gazette* affirmed: "No one, it is believed, has the strong hold on the nation's affections that Gen. Cass has. His whole career is public and without reproach."<sup>13</sup> The owner of the *Detroit Free Press* in 1853 was W. F. Storey. Charles Perry said of him:

In the conduct of his paper he gathered an able staff around him and ruled them with an iron discipline. He respected no man's opinions with the possible exception of those of Lewis Cass. He declared that he wanted no friends, as having friends would hamper his freedom in printing the news.<sup>14</sup>

*Harper's Weekly* referred to Cass as a "monumental figure. No man has filled so large a place in American history. Many presidents will rank, in after times, beneath Clay, Webster, Calhoun, Marcy, and Cass."<sup>15</sup> From another quarter Cass was honored:

... the Indians who as late as the last council in Detroit, of the Chippewas, Ottawas, and Pottawatomies July 25, 1855, testified their respect for and confidence in him by abandoning their discussion, flocking about him,

<sup>10</sup> Hewlett, "Lewis Cass," 166-167. "During his second term in the Senate, 1851-1857, Cass dominated if he did not completely control the foreign policy of the Democratic Party." *Ibid.* A ball was given in honor of Cass on February 22, 1851, at Tammany Hall.

<sup>11</sup> *Ann Arbor Signal of Liberty*, July 15, 1844.

<sup>12</sup> *Baltimore Sun* as quoted by the *Detroit Free Press*, September 15, 1852.

<sup>13</sup> *Hillsdale Gazette*, January 8, 1852.

<sup>14</sup> Charles M. Perry, "The Newspaper Attack on Dr. Tappan," *Michigan History Magazine*, X (1926), 499.

<sup>15</sup> *Harper's Weekly*, April 11, 1857.

grasping his hand and saluting him as an old and valued friend when he unexpectedly entered the council room.<sup>16</sup>

Apparently there was a rapid decline in the influence of the Michigan statesman when he was forced to leave the Senate. Even the friendly *Detroit Free Press* admitted: "More than any great statesman alive does he [Cass] occupy the position of a disinherited patriot."<sup>17</sup> Between 1844 and 1855, the *Free Press* had anticipated the stump engagements of Cass by announcing his itinerary as well as naming the other Democratic speakers appearing on the program with the Michigan Senator. During these years, the name of Cass invariably led the list: "Gen. Cass, Gov. Felch, and Gov. McClelland. . ."<sup>18</sup> Beginning in 1856, however, the same journal began to report: "Speeches by Breckinridge, Dickinson, Preston, Cass and Felch. . ."<sup>19</sup> "No longer to be reckoned with as a power in the West, Cass was virtually forgotten in the Democratic strategy which preceded the Cincinnati Convention of 1856."<sup>20</sup>

The historian has looked in vain for any expression of Cass' opinion on the momentous issues of 1858, 1859, and 1860. . . . As a cabinet officer [Secretary of State], he was forgotten to a degree that hardly seems possible. Even the Michigan Democracy disowned him. In the state convention which met in Detroit in June, 1860, a delegate moved that Cass, who was in the city, be invited to attend the convention as a guest; but after a brief discussion the motion was tabled and forgotten.<sup>21</sup>

The active political career of Cass came to an end when he resigned the position of Secretary of State. Stripped of the respect and prestige which for years had been his as head of the Democratic party, his return to Michigan was a sad affair. Cass was, in effect, going home to die after a long political life which had been marked with misfortune. He had been defeated for the presidency in 1848; the nation had condemned his popular sovereignty thesis after its ignominious failure in Kansas in 1856; he had been repudiated by his own state and forced out of the Senate during the same year; and he found himself in 1861 in a position which left him no alternative but resignation. Moreover, "he now saw simul-

<sup>16</sup> Thomas W. Palmer, *Congressional Record*, 50th Congress, 2nd session, 2002.

<sup>17</sup> *Detroit Free Press*, January 11, 1856.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, October 19, 1852.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, September 7, 1856.

<sup>20</sup> Hewlett, "Lewis Cass," 279.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 291.



taneously with the defeat of his party which he loved, the country which he had served, going rapidly, he believed, to inevitable dissolution and destruction."<sup>22</sup>

In 1889, W. F. Poole suggested to the Houghton-Mifflin Company,<sup>23</sup> which was publishing a series of biographies dealing with great American statesmen, that Andrew C. McLaughlin<sup>24</sup> be asked to do the life of Lewis Cass. John T. Morse, editor of the Statesmen Series, replied that the series was closed.<sup>25</sup> Later Morse changed his mind. His letter to McLaughlin casts some light upon the subject of the prestige of Cass at the time, twenty-three years after his death:

Several months ago it was suggested to me that you might like to write a life of Cass for the American Statesmen Series. It did not, at the time, fall in with my plan to include Cass in the Series, but upon further consideration I am inclined to revise this decision. The political growth and characteristics of the Northwest are not depicted in any volume as yet, and I think that this leaves a hiatus which I ought to fill. It is rather for this purpose than because Cass himself seems to me, as an individual, to deserve to be included, that I have made up my mind [to] add his biography. . . . I say this only in order to show you the *motive* which I should like to have you bear in mind in writing the book, if you undertake it. I do not conceive that Cass did much in the way of shaping the policy, or controlling the fortunes of the country, or in creating public opinion; therefore his personality should not be the dominating interest of the book, as in the case of Jefferson and Hamilton.<sup>26</sup>

A granddaughter of Cass informed McLaughlin that her mother was pleased about the fact that an historian was going to write

<sup>22</sup> William E. Chandler, *Congressional Record*, 50th Congress, 2nd session, 2007.

<sup>23</sup> "I have just written a letter to Houghton-Mifflin and Co., warmly commending the paper you read at Washington, and advising them to ask you to prepare a life of Gov. Cass for the series of 'American Statesmen.'" Letter from W. F. Poole to A. C. McLaughlin, January 14, 1889. Andrew C. McLaughlin Papers. Michigan Historical Collections, University of Michigan.

<sup>24</sup> McLaughlin was a professor of history at the University of Michigan. He had read a paper in Washington entitled "The Influence of Governor Cass on the Development of the Northwest," which had considerably impressed W. F. Poole. Although McLaughlin was a Republican, his subsequent book presented Cass as a truly great statesman. This is the only biography of Cass that has been done by a professional historian.

<sup>25</sup> Letter from John T. Morse to James J. Angell, January 15, 1889. Andrew C. McLaughlin Papers.

<sup>26</sup> Letter from John T. Morse to Andrew C. McLaughlin, April 16, 1889. *Ibid.*

a biography of her father. Heretofore, said Elizabeth Cass Goddard, "everything relating to him that has been published has been for some political purpose, and therefore most unsatisfactory."<sup>27</sup>

The political career of Lewis Cass spanned fifty-five years, one of the longest on record. Perhaps Cass deserves no more recognition than he is receiving. There are some, however, who disagree. Quaife said that Cass was "the peer in character, patriotism, and ability of any of his contemporaries. . . ."<sup>28</sup> Dwight L. Dumond declared categorically: "He was the greatest statesman that Michigan ever produced."<sup>29</sup>

WALTER W. STEVENS

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

<sup>27</sup> Letter from Elizabeth Cass Goddard to Andrew C. McLaughlin, August 29 (no year provided). *Ibid.*

<sup>28</sup> Quaife, "Some Reflections," 1.

<sup>29</sup> Statement from a lecture by Dwight L. Dumond, January 1957, at the University of Michigan.

## Book Reviews

*Illinois Internal Improvements, 1818-1848.* By John H. Krenkel. Torch Press, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, 1958. Pp. 252. \$4.00.

This book represents a thorough treatment of Illinois's participation in the internal improvement craze which swept the country in the late 1820's and 1830's. Dr. Krenkel deals expertly with all phases of the extravagant program including a detailed analysis of the beginnings of the system, the feeble and unsuccessful efforts of private enterprise to construct the improvements, the law of 1837 committing the state to build the projects, the administration, construction, and financing of the system, the ensuing financial disaster, and the eventual liquidation of the state debt.

Dr. Krenkel writes sympathetically of his subject, and with a complete knowledge of it gained through extensive research in newspapers, government documents, collection of letters, and other archival material. The book is carefully footnoted, well indexed, contains a series of helpful appendices and a folding map showing the proposed system in 1838. This study, originally a doctoral dissertation, is not intended for the layman. The author's straightforward and concise style, however, makes a difficult and complex subject easy to read and understand. Certainly the topic will never need to be rewritten, and the monograph serves as a valuable and basic study for a more extensive treatment of the internal improvement "extravaganza" during the second quarter of the nineteenth century.

The shortcomings are minor ones and those which are likely to appear in most books. Mentioning those detected in no way lessens the importance of the work. The fact that there is only one item listed in the bibliography published in the last twenty years is not so much the fault of the author as the neglect of historians to do research in this fruitful area. Dr. Krenkel obviously drew a bit too heavily on certain chapters in the *Frontier State* written by Theodore Calvin Pease. Some repetition was noted such as occurs on pages 49-50 repeated to some extent on pages 75-76, and on page 197 repeated on page 213. In summary it can be said, however, that the book is a useful addition to the history of Illinois during the Jacksonian era.

GENE D. LEWIS

University of Cincinnati

*Spanish Colonial Administration, 1782-1810: The Intendant System in the Viceroyalty of the Rio de la Plata.* By John Lynch. University of London, The Athlone Press, London, and Essential Books, Fair Lawn, New Jersey, 1958. Pp. xi, 335. 42s.

The impact of the intendant system from the time it was superimposed on the Spanish colonies has been a subject of continuing interest to historians. Professor Lynch, of the University of Liverpool, previously demon-

strated his research and ability in this area in his article "Intendants and Cabildos in the Viceroyalty of La Plata, 1782-1810," (*HAHR*, XXXV, August 1955). In the present volume he expands the theme set forth in that article and analyzes the effect of the intendant system on the viceroy, the exchequer, public administration, the Indian, and the audiencia, concluding with an analysis of the intendant and the revolution.

The early chapters are concerned with the general changes in administrative structure in the colonial system from Philip V through Charles III, and with the "stepchild" province of the Río de la Plata from its foundation until the establishment of the viceroyalty in 1776. Indicating that the interest of the crown in creating a new viceroyalty arose essentially from Charles III's fear of Britain and Portugal, Professor Lynch sees the intendants introduced as an additional aid to assure internal order and security. Geographic and personnel problems were thorny, the latter especially so, as the time-worn prejudice against the Creoles still remained, "... for they lacked the mode of thinking... prevalent in Spain...", and the difficulty of obtaining competent Spaniards proved so enormous that from time to time they had no alternative but to engage a "native."

When he considers the relationship of the intendants to the viceroy, Professor Lynch writes a most interesting chapter. How could the division of power implicit in the intendant system harmonize with the stature and prestige of the viceroy? His narrative of the struggle between Viceroy Loreto and Superintendent Sanz might seem to indicate that harmony was not to be expected because of intrinsic differences in the systems. However, Professor Lynch is careful to point out that this and other conflicts which existed were primarily conflicts of personalities and not of institutions. The newness of the viceroyalty in this area should have insured the compatible growth of the two systems and, with certain modifications of jurisdiction, there seemed no intrinsic reason why harmonious and efficient administration could not have been obtained.

In the attempted financial reorganization, high hopes were held for increased revenue from mines and taxes as well as for increased efficiency. However, patronage, sale of offices, and personnel problems mired down these hopes. The lethargy in mining techniques could not be surmounted even for a foreign mission, one of whose members described the methods of Potosí miners as steeped in "... incredible barbarism and ignorance..."

The unhappy lot of the Indian was not improved by the intendant system. Perhaps the kindest words the author has on the subject are that the intendants were not indifferent toward the natives but that they had the very "disconcerting" habit of indulging in theoretical discussions while practical problems of the *encomiendas* and *mita* went unsolved. His words are sharp for the administrators of the former Jesuit reductions. Disinterest, inefficiency and desire for profit are pointed out as characteristics of the new secular administration. While generally critical, Professor Lynch does not fail to point out those voices crying for justice, such as that of Viedma in the Cochabamba area who tried to get a fair land distribution for the Indian, and González in Puno who refused to send the *mita* quota to Potosí, and Villava of the audiencia of Charcas who strove unsuccessfully to gain condemnation of the *mita*. His conclusion

is that Spain lacked a clear policy and that advances, if any, were made only by virtue of the quality of the individual.

An interesting phenomenon is presented in the case of the *cabildos* and in particular the *cabildo* of Buenos Aires. Weak and impoverished before the establishment of the new system, the enhanced commerce, interest in public works, and civic responsibilities, appear to have given them a new life and a sense of power they had known only rarely in times past. This advent of strength in the face of a system designed to strengthen centralization rather than localize authority is explained in part by the hands-off policy pursued toward *cabildo* elections, as well as by the increase in their funds due to the activity of the intendants. Demands made on the *cabildos* for statements of accounts as well as for estimates of tax requirements seemed to have stimulated the old institutions to new and vigorous activity. The conclusions are that this reinvigoration at the hands of the new system prepared the *cabildo* for its role in the days of revolution. The author points out that not only did this maturing of the *cabildos* set the stage for revolution, but that the whole structure of the intendant system worked as a divisive force, weakening the colonial administrative structure prior to the days of Ferdinand VII.

For the most part this study is original, from unpublished documents of Seville. It is fine history and an eminently worthwhile contribution. The appendix, glossary, bibliography, and index are excellently done.

MARTIN J. LOWERY

De Paul University

*The Making of an American Community.* By Merle Curti. Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, 1959. Pp. vii, 483. \$8.50.

"This place [remarked the Reverend Mr. D. O. Van Slyke] used to be noted for . . . good society, pleasant surroundings, and well defined moral influences. Has the reverse come to be true? Have we no civil laws and civil forces? Has Galesville ceased to be America? Have all or most all the better classes moved away?" This complaint sounds like many voiced in 1959 but it appeared in the *Galesville* [Wisconsin] *Independent* on October 3, 1878, nearly eighty-one years ago. The words seem to assure us that although social conditions may not be ideal at present, they are at least as good as they were eighty-one years ago. Hence, things are perhaps not getting worse; they are simply remaining as bad as they already were.

The above quotation and scores equally pertinent are found in *The Making of an American Community*, a microscopic study made of an "area that experienced transition from wilderness to settled community with the purpose of determining how much democracy, in Turner's sense, existed initially in the first phase of settlement, during the process itself, and in the period that immediately followed." The area studied was



Trempeleau County, in the central part of western Wisconsin. This county was not studied because it was considered "typical" of frontiers in general. It was simply a frontier, and one blessed with good records. Ten newspapers were available, as were three important collections of private papers, plus unusually well preserved county records. At least one good history of the county had already been published. The period studied extended from the 1850's to the 1880's.

In addition to employing historical research in the ordinary meaning of the term, Dr. Merle Curti and his four main assistants used quantitative methods whenever these seemed appropriate and feasible. Using codes, the members of this research team recorded on cards all householders and gainfully employed individuals listed in the unpublished federal censuses of 1850, 1860, 1870, 1880. Generalizations were then based on comprehensive data, rather than on samples or on impressions based on incomplete records.

Chapter titles such as "Social and Economic Structure," "Making a Living on the Farm," and "Choosing Officials" are indicative of the results of the research. The one entitled "The Social Creed" seems particularly illustrative of the community. Samuel Luce, editor of the *Galesville Independent*, often argued in his editorials that the West, or, the frontier, contributed in a very real sense to the development of "fine human beings, people with confidence in themselves." In the issue of August 1, 1862, he maintained in an editorial that the Westerners were by no means the incompetent and stupid people that the Easterners considered them to be. Each individual in the West, Luce maintained, tended to become an important factor in multiplying "the facilities of civilization." Convinced of his own importance and realizing that he could not be spared, "the pioneer found life more living than his fellows who stayed in the East and lived their lives under less taxing conditions." However, crimes did occur in this latter day Eden. The newspapers reported that some shops had been robbed. One man rightfully complained because someone had stolen his heifer, killed it and made off with the meat. Lawsuits involving ownership of land were common, giving employment to many lawyers. Fights and brawls were frequent but it seems that few murders took place. Gun fights were not common in this part of the West.

Many helpful tables presenting detailed statistical data concerning such matters as the farms of the settlers, family income, school attendance, occupational changes, receipts and disbursements of the county treasurer's office and the cost of schools are given. For factual information concerning the growth of a community, this study leaves nothing to be desired. It is strongly recommended to anyone interested in the history of the American frontier.

PAUL KINIERY

Loyola University, Chicago

## Notes and Comments

*Andrew Jackson and North Carolina Politics*, by William S. Hoffmann, was published late last year as Volume 40 of The James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science by The University of North Carolina Press at Chapel Hill. Hoffmann's theme is North Carolina politics from 1824 to 1837 in the setting of defamation and character assassination of the Jacksonian era. His purpose is to examine the North Carolina segment of the national political picture, North Carolina's place in the vital development of the two party system, and Andrew Jackson's influence in the formation of North Carolina's political character. Granting that historians have covered the dramatic clashes between "Old Hickory" and Biddle, Clay, Calhoun, and Webster, Hoffmann goes quickly to his study in North Carolina. His work is thoroughly documented and compressed into 134 pages. In an exceptional summary, Chapter XII, "Evaluation and Conclusions," Hoffmann finds that during his first term as President, Jackson satisfied North Carolina by holding to Jefferson's state rights doctrine. Needing a low tariff the state turned away from Clay and Webster. Jackson's dismissal of John Branch, former governor of North Carolina, from his cabinet helped vastly in gathering together all anti-Jacksonists into state extremists, who in turn became part of the Whig party. In general: "The story of North Carolina politics from 1824 to 1837 is the story of politicians maneuvering to gain or maintain political power. . . . The majority of the people of North Carolina loved Jackson." (P. 117)

\* \* \* \*

There should be more books written in the clear, concise, and penetrating manner of *Robert Lansing and American Neutrality, 1914-1917*, by Daniel M. Smith. This is Volume 59 of the University of California Publications in History, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1958. Such a study could not have been written if a new documentary source had not been opened recently, that is, the Confidential Memoranda of Robert Lansing. These materials lead Mr. Smith to the positive conclusion "that not only was Lansing's role of supreme importance but that his tenure in the Department of State has earned for him a place among the leading American secretaries of state." Eight

chapters amply substantiate this general conclusion, while the ninth chapter is a summary of Lansing's enormous part in the fashioning of American war diplomacy. A new Lansing emerges. The paper-covered volume is of 241 pages, including an excellent bibliography and index.

In this same series of Publications in History, Volume 62 is *Bondsmen and Bishops, Slavery and Apprenticeship on the Codrington Plantations of Barbados, 1710-1838*, by J. Harry Bennett, Jr. This is an interesting and important study based upon a complete body of documents newly discovered by Frank J. Klingberg in the London archives of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts of the Anglican Church. By an odd will Christopher Codrington in 1710 bequeathed his two sugar plantations to the Society with the stipulation that the Society was to man a college on the island with professors under the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, who were to operate the plantations and take care of the bodies and souls of 300 slaves. How the committee of Church of England bishops got around the will and managed the estates for over a century is Mr. Bennett's interesting contribution.

\* \* \* \*

*Saint Anthony's Century, 1858-1958*, by Hilda Engbring Feldhake, was published by St. Anthony of Padua Church, Effingham, Illinois, in commemoration of the foundation and the hundred years of service of the Church. This is a remarkable example of local and parochial history and may well serve as a model of data gathering for local historical societies. By painstaking research and thorough collecting of evidence Mrs. Feldhake amassed enough historical material to fill a pictorial museum. A great number of the pictures of individuals and groups are handsomely printed in the volume. Part One, traces the history of the town of Effingham and its surroundings from the original settlement to the present, with the story of the growth of the parish interwoven. Genealogies of families, biographical sketches of townsmen and pastors, charts of land ownership, and origins of civic and rural institutions are incorporated and suitably illustrated. No name of a contributor to the growth of Effingham and its Catholic parish is omitted. Parish statistics and a chronological table of events complete the first part. Part Two has to do with the parish and its many services in the community. The contributions of man power of this German-American town during the Civil War,

the Spanish-American War, and the World Wars were notable. The primary and secondary schools have long satisfied the educational needs under the direction of the religious and lay instructors. Besides carrying out its religious functions the church became the center of many social, cultural, and civic activities, each of which has its place in the well-arranged volume. The list price is a very reasonable five dollars.

\* \* \* \*

Scholars are again indebted to The Newberry Library, this time for the publication of *A Catalogue of Printed Materials Relating to the Philippine Islands, 1519-1900, in the Newberry Library*, as compiled by Doris Varner Welsh. This checklist completes the catalogue of printed materials in the Ayer Collection of the Newberry and adds many items on linguistics to those listed in Mrs. Welch's *Checklist of Philippine Linguistics*, published by the Library in 1950. Of over 3,000 items in the Philippine collection the *Checklist* named more than a thousand, while the present *Catalogue* lists nearly 1,900, classified under the headings of political, religious, social, economic, and local history. The manuscripts in the Ayer Collection were well taken care of by Paul S. Lietz in his *Calendar of Philippine Documents in the Ayer Collection*, published in 1956. Thus, the scholar has the bibliographic tools for investigating in a rich collection of Filipiniana. The materials listed cover Philippine history and ethnology only, and are second in this country in volume to those in the Library of Congress which cover all phases of Philippine life.

\* \* \* \*

*Seventy-five Years of Latin American Research at the University of Texas*, is Latin American Studies XVIII of the publications of The Institute of Latin American Studies of the University of Texas, Austin. Here is a complete and imposing list of 670 doctoral and master's dissertations on Latin American subjects written between 1893 and 1958, and a second list of publications between 1941 and 1958. This is definitely a help to libraries and to professors directing research in Latin American and Texas history. It is hoped that the 67 page booklet will be an inspiration to other universities to publish similar lists of their scholarly productions.

\* \* \* \*

Just born: *Journal of Inter-American Studies*, Volume I, Number 1, January, 1959. Published by the School of Inter-American Studies, University of Florida, Gainesville, under a grant from the Pan-American Foundation, Inc., the *Journal* is under the General Editor, Robert E. McNicholl, Associate Editor, A. Curtis Wilgus, five contributing editors, and three consultants. The *Journal* publishes studies on all aspects of the Americas in any of the official languages of the American countries and offers itself as a new means for the interchange of scholarly ideas especially in the humanities and social sciences. The initial number in 102 pages has stimulating articles by Dantès Bellegarde, C. Harvey Gardiner, Elena Vérez de Peraza, Harold E. Davis, José J. Arrom, J. Fred Rippy, and Aurelio de la Vega. We advise you to obtain it at two dollars for the annual subscription at the address of the *Journal of Inter-American Studies*, Box 3625, University Station, Gainesville, Florida.

\* \* \* \*

On January 10, 1612, James I, "By the Grace of Almighty God, who created Heaven and Earth, Kinge of great Brittain, France, and Ireland, Defendor of the Christian Faith, &ct.," wrote a letter "To the High and Mightie, the Emperor of Japan, &ct.," asking for a treaty of trade and commerce. This letter is in the James Ford Bell Collection of the University of Minnesota. It has now been reproduced and put in the latest publication of the Collection, a beautifully printed brochure of twenty-four pages entitled *A Royal Request for Trade*. The brochure has a Foreword by John Parker, Curator, and the letter is placed in its historical setting by David Harris Willison. The brochure is a fine addition to the growing list of similar publications by the James Ford Bell Collection.

\* \* \* \*

*The King Can Do No Wrong*, by William L. Reuter, is a recent addition to the Lincolniana in 1958. The little volume of sixty-two pages tells of the capture of John Wilkes Booth by Colonel Everton J. Conger and of Booth's death at the hands of Sergeant Corbett. Fifty-one years after the assassination of Lincoln, Colonel Conger was asked to dictate the story of his search for the assassin. Conger did so, but his narrative never found its way into print until Professor Reuter decided to preserve it in this book. Conger's own words remain as he dictated them, and Reuter has interspersed



passages descriptive of the times and persons, adding as an "Aftermath" the trial of the other conspirators and the attempts to save Mrs. Surratt. The whole is a highly dramatic presentation. It is published by Pageant Press and its list price is \$2.50.

\* \* \* \*

With the peoples of the world insecure in the cold war and in unsettled domestic conditions two men have come forth with plans for world peace. The plans begin at opposite points, one with the renovation of the individual human being and the other with a super-governmental force capable of enforcing world peace. *Permanent Peace, a Check and Balance Plan*, by Tom Slick, published by Prentice Hall in 1958, offers a step by step program whereby the machinery for collective security may be established. The author is widely known for his vast activities in businesses, philanthropies and research. The other plan, *Toward a New World*, by the Italian Jesuit, Richard Lombardi, translated into English and published by Philosophical Library, Inc., in 1958, has been widely announced to vast audiences in Europe for over ten years. If society is to be renovated and peace established the individual member of society must renovate himself according to the principles of the Gospel. The individual is given practical advice on establishing peace and security in his own home, with his neighbor, in his community, and his local institutions of government, politics, business, education, and labor. The local renovation when multiplied becomes a state, then national renovation and then world-wide, until a family of nations appears following the great principles of the love of God and neighbor.